



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2000

No. 58

Senate

The Senate met at 9:32 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO, a Senator from the State of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Edward Robinson, from the Central Union Church, Honolulu, HI.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Dr. Edward Robinson, offered the following prayer:

Let us speak together in prayer.

Almighty God, our Creator and our Redeemer, there are those across the aisle or awaiting us in our office or in some other corner of the world whose might and power trouble us and may even make us afraid, but Your strength grants us courage. There are those whose intelligence and oratory make us feel humbled and vulnerable, but Your wisdom gives us grace to meet the challenge.

There are those whose laughter and jibes or the things they write about us sometimes hurt, ridicule, and demean us, but Your smile makes us welcome and tells us we are worthwhile. There are those whose schemes and dreams for humanity confuse, bewilder, and terrify us, but Your vision for our lives gives us joy and hope.

Lord, in this incredible arena of power and decisionmaking, in these incredible times as citizens of this land, surrounded by all these incredible people, teach us to use our God-given talents to serve as You have served us. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2000.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule 1, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO, a Senator from the State of Idaho, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CRAPO thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I give the opening script for the leader, I would like to defer to the Senator from Hawaii for a few minutes.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

GUEST CHAPLAIN, DR. EDWARD "TED" ROBINSON

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am very pleased and extremely honored to welcome to the Senate our guest Chaplain today, Rev. Dr. Edward Merritt "Ted" Robinson of Central Union Church in Honolulu.

Dr. Robinson is senior minister at Central Union Church in Honolulu, the largest United Church of Christ in the West and 1 of the 10 largest in the United States. Central Union was founded over 150 years ago, and the "Church in the Garden" is renowned

for its commitment to community outreach as much as for its beautiful sanctuary. For over a century, the congregation has worked to put its faith into action in Hawaii, nationally, and throughout Asia and the Pacific.

Dr. Robinson has served as senior minister at Central Union for 15 years and has ministered in the United Church of Christ for over 30 years. He was born in Westwood, MA, and received his bachelor's degree from Yankton College and bachelor of theology degree from Yankton School of Theology. He holds a master's of divinity from United Seminary in St. Paul and master's of sacred theology from the Iliff School of Theology at the University of Denver. He earned his doctor of ministry degree at San Francisco Theological Seminary.

In addition to his work in the United Church of Christ, Dr. Robinson has served on a number of boards and commissions in Honolulu including the Salvation Army, Girl Scouts, Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children, Hawaii Habitat for Humanity, and Honolulu Boy Choir.

Ted and Barbara Robinson are the proud parents of two children, Sarah and Jonathan, and one granddaughter.

When we are home in Hawaii, we frequently worship at Central Union. Ted Robinson is one of the finest preachers to grace Hawaii. He is a friend and source of comfort for me and my family and inspires his active and growing congregation to live their lives as courageous people of faith. By word and deed, he embraces the mission of Central Union inscribed in the sanctuary above the altar: "Love Never Faileth."

It is my pleasure and privilege to welcome my good friend and minister to the Senate.

Aloha.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We thank the Senator and join with him in his gracious welcome to Reverend Robinson.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we all thank Reverend Robinson for his

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3857

prayer this morning and for his leadership in the spiritual world.

SCHEDULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the leader, I will announce today's business.

The Senate will resume debate on the conference report to accompany the African Growth and Opportunity Act. By previous consent, at 10 a.m. the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the conference report. If cloture is invoked, debate will resume with the anticipation of an early afternoon vote on final passage of the trade bill. Senators will be notified as further votes are scheduled.

Following the disposition of this important legislation, it is hoped the Senate can begin consideration of the military construction appropriations bill.

The leader thanks colleagues for their attention and cooperation.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 4386

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4386) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. is equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I defer to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I do thank my colleague, who will be speaking momentarily. I want to simply recapitulate some of the statements made yesterday, of which the first and the most important is to say this is the first trade bill to come to the floor of the Senate in 6 years. It is not simply that there have not been matters to attend to, it is rather that we have not been able to attend to them.

Most important, we have been unable to provide the President with negotiating authority for future trade agreements in the manner that developed over the last half century, following the epochal decision and action in the first term of President Roosevelt under Cordell Hull to begin the reciprocal trade agreements program. Under that program, the United States negotiated with individual countries, and then after World War II with a group of countries gathered together under the umbrella of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 gave the President the authority to negotiate and proclaim tariff reductions and that procedure evolved, in 1974, into the trade agreements negotiating authority, whereby the Congress gave the President the opportunity to reach a common agreement with other countries and then send it to the Congress to be approved up or down, not to be negotiated item by item as we had done in the disastrous Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930. We have never had a tariff bill as such on the Senate floor in 70 years.

The administration was hesitant about asking the Congress to renew this authority. When finally it did, we were hesitant about giving it, and it looked for a while as if an enormous, a momentous event in the world economy and the American economy and in the political stability of the world was being lost. The role of trade has become so important. Many of the principal actors in the Second World War were at war with each other in very much trade-related matters. It would now be thought inconceivable for any such conflict to take place.

I say this because not only was this the first bill in six years, but yesterday we began our debate on an auspicious note with a resounding vote of 90-6 in support of the motion to proceed to the conference report, and now we will vote to invoke cloture. I trust we will do so with the same resounding vote.

This is a good bill. It is not perfect, nor will it solve all the economic problems of sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, but it will help, as Senator GRASSLEY and others said yesterday. My esteemed colleague, the Senator from Iowa, is here representing Senator ROTH, the chairman of our committee, who is recovering from surgery and who will be back with us next week when on next Wednesday we will take up in the Finance Committee the propo-

sition of permanent normal trade relations with China, an epic decision we will have to make and which I think we will be able to make in the context of this legislation having succeeded.

I remind all who might be listening that 6 months ago, this legislation was dead. It was not going anywhere. The House had passed a measure limited to Africa and not very well received over here. They had not included anything for the Caribbean Basin and Central America, as we call it, a program begun under President Reagan, and the Finance Committee took it up. The Finance Committee worked for 6 months on this matter.

I know there are persons who feel it is unacceptable because it does not contain provisions that provide for assistance to sub-Saharan Africa with respect to HIV/AIDS.

I say to my friends, the Senate did have such a provision. We fought for it in conference. We were not able to succeed because on the House side it was thought the legislation was a trade measure and public health issues were not relevant.

But also, absent economic development, there will be no controlling this epidemic in Africa, anymore than in the subcontinent of Asia, and we will not have anything in which to begin an engagement on these matters—nothing. Anyone who comes to this body thinking that legislation which is not perfect is unacceptable will often be disappointed. I was disappointed with the extent to which persons spoke yesterday about rejecting this legislation because it was not perfect.

I note that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a measure, S. 2382, the Technical Assistance, Trade Promotion and Anti-Corruption Act of 2000, which includes some important provisions addressing this public health crisis. Other suggestions are under review. These include proposed tax incentives to promote vaccine development. These tax incentives will come to the Finance Committee.

I am sure my friend from Iowa will agree that Senators who accept what we have done today, even if not perfect, will find a much more receptive Finance Committee. We have worked very hard on this. We know perfectly well the facts, and we propose to address them in a context where we will have a tax bill. We will try to get a tax bill on the House side, and we will enact something of much greater consequence than anything now contemplated.

I offer a further thought, which is that on May 3, the Wall Street Journal reported, and I was advised of this in advance, that the Pfizer pharmaceutical company—one of the oldest, the one which developed penicillin during World War II, the British having discovered it and not having the capacity to produce it; a great firm with great successes—had offered to provide one of its drug therapies for HIV infection, called Diflucan, at no cost to

South Africans. There is a press announcement from Geneva this morning that five pharmaceutical companies—Merck, Bristol Myers Squibb, Glaxo Wellcome, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Roche—are participating in a collaborative initiative with the United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, which is termed UNAIDS to “explore ways to accelerate and improve the provision of HIV/AIDS-related care and treatment in developing countries.”

Does the Presiding Officer wish me to cease and desist?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The time allocated to the minority side has expired.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Fine.

I would simply close by saying, sir, as to the matter of worker rights, the amendment to the CBI legislation offered on this matter was offered by Senator LEVIN, which I cosponsored. It provided that the President must take into account the extent to which a prospective CBI beneficiary country protects internationally recognized worker rights. That is to say, the core labor standards established by the ILO. I report to the Senate that this was retained in the conference agreement, as were many other Senate amendments.

I thank the Chair and I regret having imposed upon my colleague's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to use 5 minutes and then give the remainder of the time to one of the opponents of the legislation, the Senator from Wisconsin. So I ask the Chair to please inform me when 5 minutes are up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so note.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the cloture motion. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion. I spoke yesterday, at length, about why this bill is such an important piece of legislation.

I guess the best proof of it is that it enjoys such bipartisan support, which does not happen too often on Capitol Hill. But I summed up, in yesterday's remarks, that this conference agreement is about opportunity—opportunity for 48 struggling nations of sub-Saharan Africa; and opportunity for the people of the Caribbean, many of whom are struggling to rebuild their lives following the devastation of their countries by natural disaster.

Most importantly, we in the Congress must be concerned about American jobs—our working men and women. This bill does much for the American economy and for America's consumers, as well. The enhanced Caribbean Basin Initiative textile provisions in this conference agreement may create up to \$8 billion in new sales and 120,000 new jobs over the next 5 years. Those are not my estimates. Those are not Senator MOYNIHAN's estimates. Those are the textile industry's own estimates.

In addition to the textile industry, this bill enjoys the support of many

other industries as well. This is because American exports follow American investment when that investment moves abroad, especially exports of capital equipment.

This conference agreement enjoys broad support among distinguished Members of both the majority and minority, who have worked together long and hard to fashion this agreement.

It also enjoys the support of a vast majority of political, civic, and religious leaders around the United States, and the support of each of the nations that would benefit from its passage.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at an advertisement in the Hill newspaper that was put out yesterday. It has a long list of prominent business leaders and organizations. It has a long list of American civic leaders who support this, including even organizations such as Empower America, which is headed by Republican Jack Kemp, and is supported by conservative leaders such as Bill Bennett.

Since it enjoys this broad, bipartisan support—both within and outside the political environment—I hope that it gets the support of our colleagues as well.

A vote for cloture is also a reaffirmation of America's historic leadership role in international trade. We have much to do in the international trade arena in the next year or two:

Restore confidence in American trade policy, and leadership in trade; rebuild confidence in the World Trade Organization; win the fight for permanent normal trade relations status for China; and show our trading partners in Geneva, where negotiations are underway right now, that we in the Senate are engaged with the world, and the world can look to us for that leadership.

I ask my colleagues to vote in support of the opportunity to continue America's leadership in the effort to reduce trade barriers. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that advertisement I mentioned in the Hill newspaper printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hill, May 10, 2000]

TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

We Endorse Legislation That Provides Social and Economic Opportunity in Africa And We, the Undersigned, are Working Together to Achieve this Goal

All 48 African Nations

Angola
Benin
Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Central Africa Republic
Chad
Comoros
Congo (Brazzaville)

Congo, Democratic Republic
Côte d'Ivoire
Djibouti
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gabon
The Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mozambique
Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Reunion
Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
South Africa
Swaziland
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Business Leaders

The Limited, Inc.
Gap Inc.
Ford Motor Company
Moving Water Industries
Chevron Corporation
Kmart Corporation
Cargill
BP Amoco Corporation
Bechtel
Exxon Corporation
Citigroup
Enron Corporation
Bank of America
Mobil Corporation
Boeing Company
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
National Retail Federation
Caterpillar, Inc.
Leon Tempelsman & Son
DaimlerChrysler
American International Group
Archer Daniels Midland Company
Foley, Hoag and Eliot
Eastman Kodak
Equator Bank HSBC
Edlow International
Eli Lilly and Company
Emerson Electric Co.
Texaco Inc.
Equitable Capital Mgmt.
Barden International
BET, Inc.
F.C. Schaffer
Fluor Corporation
WorldSpace, Inc.
General Electric
General Motors Corporation
Halliburton/Brown & Root
Harris Corporation
Holland & Knight
Iridium LLC
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical
Lehman Brothers
Corporate Council on Africa
Louis Berger International
Manchester Trade
McDermott Incorporated
McDonald's Corporation
Modern Africa Fund Managers
Motorola Inc.

Moving Water Industries
 National Soft Drink Association
 New Africa Advisers
 Occidental International
 Ocean Energy
 Oracle
 Philip Morris
 PriceWaterhouseCoopers
 Pryor, McClendon, Counts & Co.
 Raytheon
 SBC Communications Inc.
 Seaboard
 Teledesic Corporation
 Tyco
 Westar Group Inc.
 International Mass Retail Association
 U.S. Chamber of Commerce
 Coalition for Employment Through Exports,
 Inc.

American Civic Leaders

Bishop Donald G.K. Ming, AME Church
 Bishop Garnett C. Henning, AME Church
 Bishop Vinton Anderson, AME Church
 The Honorable Leon Sullivan
 Mel Foote, CFA
 Ambassador Andrew Young
 Former Mayor David Dinkins
 Mayor Wellington Webb
 The Honorable Kweisi Mfume
 Mrs. Coretta Scott King
 Mr. Martin Luther King III
 Mr. Robert Johnson, BET, Inc.
 Mr. C. Payne Lucas
 Constituency for Africa
 National Council of Churches
 Africare
 International Foundation for Education and
 Self-Help
 Education Africa
 Africa-America Institute
 African Development Foundation
 World Vision
 Service and Development Agency (SADA)
 African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church
 Corporate Council on Africa
 Organization Industrialization Council Inter-
 national
 NAACP
 Washington Law Society
 Foundation for Democracy in Africa
 National Association of Negro and Profes-
 sional Women's Club
 National Bar Association
 United States Conference of Mayors
 National Conference of Black Mayors
 National Council of Churches
 Africa Travel Association
 Black Professionals in International Affairs
 Southern Christian Leadership Conference
 National Association of State Legislatures
 National Association of Minority Contrac-
 tors
 National Black Chamber of Commerce
 National Black Media Coalition
 National Black Republican Council
 Council of 100 Black Republicans
 Nigerian American Alliance
 U.S. Business Council
 Ron Brown Foundation
 Goodworks International
 Empower America

President Clinton: "Our Administration strongly supports the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which I said in my State of the Union Address, we will work to pass in this session of Congress."

Majority leader Trent Lott: "I support legislation that is good for Americans and Africans."

The African Diplomatic Corps: "The House of Representatives should seize this opportunity to open a new, historic chapter in the relations between Africa and the United States. It will mark a true beginning for an independent Africa and this great nation."

Reverend Leon Sullivan, IFESH: "The African Growth and Opportunity Act will open

new markets for American products and will create additional jobs for Americans and Africans. For every \$1 billion in exports to Africa, 14,000 jobs are created or sustained in the United States."

We Urge Senate Conferees to Report the: African Growth and Opportunity Act!—AGOA Coalition, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me first thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy in giving me this time to speak in opposition.

Mr. President, I rise to take another opportunity to express my disappointment with the conference report on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I have outlined my concerns about this bill time and again. I have explained how little opportunity it really offers to the countries of Africa. I have expressed my fears about transshipment. I have noted the bill's failure to address the environmental issues that are inextricably linked with trade and investment. And, most importantly, I have pointed out the rather obvious fact that unless we get serious about reducing Africa's debt burden and fighting the region's devastating HIV/AIDS crisis, any effort to stimulate trade and investment is simply an act of political theater.

By refusing to address the core obstacles prohibiting so much of that vast continent from achieving its potential as a region of prosperity and a valued trading partner, this Senate is once again ignoring the tough issues in favor of the ultimately futile quick fix. We are capable of better, and the people of Africa are certainly deserving of more.

I felt this way before learning the outcome of the conference—I felt this way last year, when I joined Congressman JESSE JACKSON, Jr., to introduce alternative legislation to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. But my disappointment was deepened, and my sense of outrage was provoked, and my resolve to fight for something better was strengthened when the outcome of the conference became apparent.

The fate of the Feinstein-Feingold amendment—a provision that was accepted into the manager's package when this bill was debated on the floor last fall but was stripped by the leadership in the final days of the conference—is appalling. Our modest amendment would have prevented the U.S. Government from pressuring African countries that use internationally legal means to make HIV/AIDS medications more accessible to their citizens. I stood on this floor yesterday and cited statistic after shocking statistic, trying to communicate the urgency of the situation and the scale of the crisis. The falling life expectancies, the overcrowded morgues, the millions of orphans, the declines in GDP—I have tried to convey the extent of the disease's reach. In light of these facts, passing legislation that prevents our Government from stopping legal efforts

to bring help and hope to the millions affected by the epidemic seemed like the least that this body could do. And yet we could not even accomplish that modest step. We could not even agree to do no harm.

And I want to remind my colleagues that this issue will not go away. Even those least inclined to give this issue the attention it deserves will not be able to ignore 5,500 deaths per day, and the social, economic, and political ramifications of those deaths. This issue will not go away as long as the HIV/AIDS crisis continues on its terrible course; this issue will not go away as long as the American public asks tough questions about why this Congress refuses to pass even modest measures like the Feinstein-Feingold amendment; and this issue will not go away as long as I am in this Senate.

Most Members didn't have to face up, publicly, to the pressure of the pharmaceutical industry and the far reaching implications of their choice to support or not support the Feinstein-Feingold amendment. But eventually we will all have to face the music, we will have to answer to our constituents and to our consciences.

The commitment of the major pharmaceutical companies to differential pricing is perhaps promising, but it raises as many questions as it answers. There is differential pricing today between the United States and Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

There is differential pricing today between Canada and the United States when it comes to pharmaceuticals, and that is a bad deal. Differential pricing does not necessarily mean the affordable pricing of drugs.

But I appreciate the courtesy in being able to speak on this matter because I believe so strongly that the voices in opposition to this bill need to be heard. We did not do the job we needed to do to create a real Africa trade bill. I regret that and will vote in opposition to cloture. I ask my colleagues to vote against cloture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 434, The African Growth and Opportunity Act:

Trent Lott, Jon Kyl, Pat Roberts, Craig Thomas, Bill Frist, Paul Coverdell, James Inhofe, Orrin Hatch, Don Nickles, Larry Craig, Slade Gorton, Mitch McConnell, Peter Fitzgerald, Chuck Grassley, Phil Gramm, and Mike Crapo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompanying H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Akaka	Graham	Mikulski
Allard	Gramm	Moynihan
Ashcroft	Grams	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Bayh	Gregg	Nickles
Bennett	Hagel	Reid
Biden	Harkin	Robb
Bond	Hatch	Roberts
Breaux	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hutchison	Santorum
Burns	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Coverdell	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Crapo	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dodd	Levin	Torricelli
Durbin	Lieberman	Torricelli
Enzi	Lott	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lugar	Warner
Fitzgerald	Mack	Wyden
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—18

Boxer	Dorgan	Leahy
Bunning	Edwards	Reed
Byrd	Feingold	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Helms	Snowe
Collins	Hollings	Thurmond
Conrad	Kennedy	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—6

Bingaman	Domenici	Lincoln
Bryan	Landrieu	Roth

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, now that we are considering the conference report on the free trade bill, which I support, I point out while this legislation is designed to improve economic conditions in sub-Saharan Africa, many of these sub-Saharan countries have struggled economically for years. As a result, that economic stagnation has also led to political unrest, civil wars, and bloody violence. Reducing violence should be a high priority all across the globe, not only on the African Continent but also a high priority in our country.

In this country, we are going to see this weekend hundreds of thousands of mothers and families in Washington marching against violence as part of the Million Mom March.

My resolution simply commends the participants of the Million Mom March this weekend for rallying their communities to ask for sensible gun safety legislation. It calls on the Congress to complete action on the juvenile justice bill, which will help promote safety and sensible legislation, and I hope to offer that resolution before the Memorial Day recess.

I will be on The Mall for the march this Sunday with, I am sure, many of my colleagues on Mother's Day, May 14, 2000, with Americans from all walks of life. In Washington and communities across the country, people will join together to call for meaningful, common-sense gun safety policies.

My resolution commends these families, citizens, members of religious congregations, schools, community-based organizations, businesses, political, and cultural groups for coming together as a local and national community to recognize the violence committed against our children from guns must cease.

I am going to continue to try my best to see if we can get action on the stalled gun safety provision that American families want us to pass.

It has now been more than a year since that terrible tragedy at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. Students at that high school were attacked in the halls of their school, in their classrooms. The result everyone knows: 12 students dead, a teacher shot dead, another 23 students and teachers injured.

I have to ask, just as they are asking—I hear it; and I know colleagues of mine hear it—what has Congress done since that time, since that awful day 1 year ago? What have we done to help reduce this violence? As I see it, not much—virtually nothing. I think it is shameful.

It is shameful because shootings have not stopped. Columbine was the most deadly school shooting. But there have been many others. It is peculiar, you often think—at least I do; I speak for myself—that we have seen the ultimate outrage, one after another: Columbine; the children being led, hand in hand, by policemen out of the school in Los Angeles; young people at a prayer meeting in Texas—and still nothing happens.

In February of this year, a little first grader was shot and killed by a classmate—a 6-year-old killing a 6-year-old. The child, Kayla Rolland, a beautiful little girl, is taken from her family. There was no explanation except that this little boy got a gun and pulled the trigger. In December of last year, a seventh grader in Fort Gibson, OK, took a handgun to school and wounded four students. These are just the school shootings since the terrible tragedy at Columbine.

Since 1997, there have been school shootings in Pearl, MS, West Paducah, KY, Jonesboro, AR, Edinboro, PA, and Springfield, OR.

There have been many other outrages outside our schools. Recently, a racist in Pittsburgh killed six people, and not too far from where we are standing, seven children were shot at the National Zoo.

Some of us have tried to address this violence. During the debate on the juvenile justice bill, the Senate passed several gun safety measures, including my amendment to require criminal background checks at gun shows. It was a very close vote. The Vice President, in his role as President of the Senate, voted to break the 50-50 tie.

I remind my colleagues that the gun show amendment had bipartisan support. I did not get 50 votes without getting some of our colleagues on the Republican side. I was pleased to have that support from Senators DEWINE, FITZGERALD, LUGAR, VOINOVICH, WARNER, and Senator John Chafee, who is no longer with us. They all voted for the amendment.

The final juvenile justice bill passed by a vote of 73-25. There was strong bipartisan support for moving forward on juvenile crime and for trying to reduce gun violence.

But what has happened since then? The gun lobby, and its congressional allies, have stalled the bill. It has been held hostage in the conference committee for more than 9 months. We need to move forward on gun safety because stopping gun violence and keeping our kids safe is too important.

When you talk about a million women marching, while they would like it, they are not marching for equal pay; they are not marching for job opportunity; they are not talking about "glass ceilings;" they are not talking about an invasion of the rights as we conventionally see them. There is one issue that is more important than any other.

They say: Dear God, help us protect our children. When we send them to school in the morning, they are healthy and smiling. We want them to come back from school the same way at the end of the day—even though they now know that there are going to be metal detectors, there are going to be guards, and there are going to be additional measures to try to maintain security.

Violence has won over much of our attention, certainly much of our budget. But we have to work to help families, some of whom have already paid a terrible price for gun violence, and others who worry about it each and every day. Because the wounds that were received were not simply the wounds that came from the gun attack, as horrible as that was, but everybody in the vicinity, everybody in those schools, were wounded by those attacks, so was our Nation. It changed the tenure of things. It made us all apprehensive.

So the gun safety provisions in the juvenile justice bill are simply commonsense measures that Congress should have enacted a long time ago.

First, we have to close the gun show loophole. There is no question that closing the gun show loophole will help prevent guns from getting into the wrong hands, including the hands of schoolchildren.

The proof is in the testimony of Robyn Anderson before the Colorado Legislature. She is the young woman who went with Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold to the Tanner gun show in Adams County, CO. She bought two shotguns and a rifle for Klebold and Harris, three of the four guns that they later used in their massacre, their shooting rampage at Columbine High School.

She testified, saying very clearly:

Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gone to the Tanner gun show on Saturday and they took me back with them on Sunday. . . . While we were walking around, Eric and Dylan kept asking sellers if they were private or licensed. They wanted to buy their guns from someone who was private—and not licensed—because there would be no paperwork or background check.

She said:

It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check.

More recently Patty Nielson, a teacher at Columbine High School, spoke about the need to close the gun show loophole. She said:

All we know for sure is that if they [Klebold and Harris] hadn't gotten these guns, they never would have killed those innocent people. And the shocking thing is that they got those guns so easily from the gun show.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from New Jersey withhold? The leader is on the floor to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I certainly would agree to that provided that I regain the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I did not hear the request, but I understand that Senator LAUTENBERG will yield so that I can proceed to a unanimous consent request at this time.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I believe that we are postcloture now, and the subject for debate should be the African and CBI trade bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct. In a postcloture situation, debate is supposed to be germane to the bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2521

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the military construction appropriations bill, S. 2521, immediately following the adoption of the African trade conference report; further, there be debate only relative to the bill, other than any amendments offered

and cleared by the two managers, which would continue until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2000.

This has been cleared with the Democratic leadership. We are extending it until this time on Tuesday at the request of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to make sure that those of us who want to speak about the Million Mom March that is coming this weekend, where we may see a quarter of a million or more moms here, and thousands more across the country, are not precluded under this UC from speaking on it in morning business. If it requires an amendment to the UC, I would hope we could work that out. Otherwise, I will object because we could talk about a lot of things, but there is no question the Million Mom March deserves to be discussed. Senator LAUTENBERG has a resolution praising the moms, and I think we should be able to discuss that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I might say, this does not preclude that. But the rules of the Senate are that once you vote on cloture, and the fact that cloture was adopted, postcloture, the debate has to be on the cloture item.

If the Senators want to talk on this subject, we will be glad to talk with them about the appropriate time to do it. But under the rules, the regular order will be that we have debate on this measure.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. After a vote on final passage, this would be entirely in order, and if a resolution is to be offered, then you could deal with the resolution; but you could not deal with it now, is that right? I ask that question of the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I may, I inquire of the Senator, what was the question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. After we have a vote on final passage, then these matters would be entirely in order, correct?

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, after the vote on the conference report, it would be debate relative to the pending bill only. But, again, we always work together to find time for Senators to have morning business and talk on subjects that they wish to talk about. But we are trying to set up a process to complete the African trade bill and then move to the military construction appropriations bill. We have it worked out. Again, we will be glad to talk to Senators who may be interested in a time when that could be done. But the rules do not allow that now.

Mrs. BOXER. I understand. I am going to have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to see it. My understanding is we are going to MILCON and we will not necessarily have an opportunity to speak—maybe we can put in a quorum call until I see that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California to withhold her objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. She has already objected. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I hope we can work this out in some amicable way. The regular order is that debate now is on the African trade and CBI conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I know the Senator from New Jersey has the floor. In an effort to resolve this, I wonder if the leader would consider, prior to going to the military construction bill, that there be a period of time for Senators to discuss this march.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again, I think we can work out a time to do this. We have a problem in that the manager of the bill has a time problem—or one of the managers—and she has to leave later on this afternoon.

Mr. REID. Also, there is nothing to prevent Senators from talking while the bill is pending.

Mr. LOTT. The point is, it would take consent in order for that to happen. Generally speaking, as long as everybody is being considerate of each other—we haven't objected to Senator LAUTENBERG speaking. But he would not be able to speak on the subject if Senators objected. He actually has spoken on both. I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill here, and we ought to be able to work through this.

Mr. REID. We will continue to work on this.

Mr. LOTT. Should I renew the request at this time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me say again, we worked very hard on both sides of the aisle to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle, including their desires to speak, but also the managers' desire to do some of their work and still be able to make other commitments. In this case, we are actually trying to protect the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, from Washington State. We ought to be able to work through that. I hope Senators will be understanding of the managers' desire to make some progress on the MILCON bill today. But at their request, which I think is reasonable, we will strike the "relative to the bill" part of the request and I will renew it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the military construction appropriations bill, S. 2521,

immediately following the adoption of the African trade conference report, and further, there be debate only, other than any amendments offered and cleared by the two managers, which would continue until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator REID and all Members. Further, I assure the minority leader that I don't intend to file a cloture motion on this bill this week. I think we can make progress on military construction. It has broad support because of what is in the base bill and also because it has the emergency funding for Kosovo and fuel for the military. I believe we can complete this bill this week.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If the majority leader will yield, when would he expect that the MILCON bill will come up and be available for debate?

Mr. LOTT. I believe we will be able to finish the debate remaining on the Africa trade bill, and sometime between 12 and 1 o'clock get a vote on that, and then we would go to MILCON. The managers would like to spend, obviously, some time on the substance of that, and then we will go forward from there.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Would there be any likelihood of a vote tomorrow on that?

Mr. LOTT. No. We will vote on the Africa trade bill today, but then we will go to debate only on MILCON, and that would go until 2:15 until Tuesday. There would be no votes on that until Tuesday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield? We have a couple more speakers on this side. Senator HARKIN is one of them and he said he would be willing to speak after the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I will speak after the vote.

Mr. REID. One of our members is tied up in judiciary, or we could be finished by noon. We will try to get him back here and speed this thing up.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the teacher, Patty Nielson, from Columbine is right in her statement. It is shocking that anyone can get a gun so easily at a gun show. The American people understand this issue. In every poll, more than 80 percent of the American people support background checks at gun shows. In fact, two-thirds of the gun owners—66 percent—support background checks on all gun sales at gun shows. Some of the other loopholes in our gun laws are also shocking. There is no reason why we should allow large-capacity ammunition clips to be imported. We banned them from being manufactured in this country, but they can still be brought in, imported.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like the Senator to respond to these questions. I want to put the importance of this resolution in context.

The Senator mentioned that it was April 10 of last year that we had the Columbine tragedy.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. April 20.

Mr. DURBIN. April 20, 1999. And if I am not mistaken, 12 or 13 high school students were killed, and more were injured during the course of that time. America was fixed on this event as no other event, despite all the gun violence, when we consider it could happen at a high school such as Columbine.

Is the Senator from New Jersey able to tell me what the response was of the Senate to that tragedy?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I call the Senate to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate must be germane to the African trade conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is regular order.

Mr. President, I have the right to establish the connection between the trade industry, and that is how I started my remarks. The fact is that one of the purposes of getting this trade matter into law is to make sure the countries we deal with that are having severe economic problems, where we see starving populations, where we see human rights ignored, corruption rampant—that is the mission of what we are doing this day. Frankly, I am not doing it exclusively so we can do more business. We would like to do more business.

The fact is that trade has another significant implication. It is a foreign policy implication. How do we deal with it? When we look through the television cameras today, we see people with malnutrition, disease, starving. We are hoping we can do something to try to alleviate those conditions.

Why is it out of order? I ask the Parliamentarian, why is it out of order to talk about the subjects that relate at home to the same things we are trying to do to help overseas? I don't understand it. I must say that I have to pose that to the Parliamentarian.

We are never so strict that you can't talk about matters that relate indirectly. Or are we going to measure it word by word what is being said here? I think it is an invasion, I must say, of the Senator's right to speak on an issue.

I am not finished with remarks on the trade commentary. I intend to close with the trade commentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All debate must be germane to the conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York, everybody's good friend here, wishes to ask a question of the majority leader. I would like Senator MOY-

NIHAN to ask him to respond with the assurance that I get the floor, if we abandon the debate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, might I ask the distinguished and forbearing majority leader, if we have a vote on the African trade bill, if the Senator from New Jersey could speak to the matter he is discussing?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe under the unanimous consent request we agreed to that he would be able to do that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That I be able to recapture—we are asking the majority leader. He speaks very clearly. I have the assurance that I will be recognized immediately after to finish the comments that I was making.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, could I inquire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask Senator LAUTENBERG if he can give us some idea about how long he thinks that might take. The reason I am inquiring again is that we do have managers of the bill who have a time problem. I would like to encourage the Senator to talk with them and get some time agreements so they can move forward with the military construction bill. I feel as if they will be able to work something out with you.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have two of our Senators who want to speak on the African free trade bill. One of the Senators wishes to speak after the vote. I placed a call and spoke to the other Senator. He is going to call me back in a few minutes as to whether he could do the same. If that is the case, the vote will take place as soon as the leader wants it on the Africa trade bill, and then they can speak after that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am not managing the bill. I know there is at least one more Senator on the floor who wants to speak on the trade bill. I understand there may be one or two on this side. We have about four or five speakers.

Mr. REID. We have three on our side.

Mr. LOTT. And a couple on our side.

Mr. REID. One of the Senators wants to speak for 45 minutes on our side. That is why I was trying to see if we could work it out so she could speak after the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. What is our status, Mr. President? I am going to ask for a vote on germaneness, if the interpretation stands.

I thought we had an accommodation with the majority leader—I was trying to be helpful—to give us a chance to finish the debate on the subjects as I described, and to make way for the vote to take place in an expeditious fashion but guaranteeing me by unanimous consent now to be able to get the floor after the vote on the trade bill has taken place. If that is the case, I will yield the floor so we can get on to the business.

I would like that representation to be made now and clearly understood.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as I understand it, the debate now postcloture has to be on the African-CBI trade bill. After that vote occurs, which shouldn't be too long from now, we would go to the military construction appropriations bill. I assume that Senators who wish to speak on this subject will want to talk with the managers of that MILCON bill, including the Senator from Washington on the other side of the aisle, who has a time problem, and work something out. I assume you can get that worked out.

I didn't know there was a consent that had been asked for that would guarantee that or how long that would be. And I am not sure the Senator wants to do that until he talks to Senator MURRAY to see what her situation is.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, as the majority leader knows very well, there is some dispute on this issue. And I have the floor. I have tried to conduct myself as the rules provide.

What I am asking the majority leader now is, if I propound a unanimous consent request, I be recognized after the vote on the trade bill and that I be permitted to speak at that time, to regain the floor. I think it is a reasonable request based on the debate that is going on now. Otherwise, we are going to have more delays than we would like to see. I want to get the African trade bill out of the way.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I don't believe there has been a unanimous consent request propounded. If there is one propounded, will the Senator be willing to include in that a time period for how long it would take? If he takes a couple of hours, he has a major problem because of his own Member's schedule. If he needs 10 minutes, then I think we could do that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I have a couple of requests. I would try to do it in 40 minutes, and work on even compressing that, I say to the leader—but 40 minutes maximum.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, if there is such a thing going on right now, some of us want to speak. If I may say, I happen to be in favor of the African trade bill. I am willing to speak after the vote. I just want to make sure we are allowed to speak on the African trade bill.

Mr. LOTT. The African trade bill? Why don't you speak now?

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to speak now. But I don't have the floor right now, and I can't get the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We can release the floor, if the leader will give me consent, and we can move on to the business.

Mr. REID. As I understand what the Senator from New Jersey said, he and the other two speakers would be willing to agree to a 40-minute time agreement today. Is that the correct way I understood the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish the Senators would at least talk to the Senator on their side of the aisle as to the time problem and see what Senator MURRAY has to say because I feel a little funny here. I am protecting Senator MURRAY's desire to do her part early. I think we could, if the Senator would agree to do this after Senator MURRAY speaks, and opening statements are made—I wish the Senator would talk to her we could agree to that. I presume it would be about 3:30 this afternoon, or so.

Mr. REID. I can't speak to this. Senator BOXER would be happy to talk to our friend. I think 40 minutes would probably do it.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to urge the Senator to talk to Senator MURRAY and see if that is agreeable with her, and to the managers of the bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We want to accommodate. I tell the leader that. Perhaps we can move it along by saying that after the opening statements by the managers—they introduce their managers' amendment—I then be able to regain the floor for the 40 minutes about which we are talking. I think that will allow us to move things along at a good pace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Is that propounded as a unanimous-consent request or simply the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was. It was a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CRAIG. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it was already agreed to. You already said it was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the Senator has the right to reserve the right to object.

The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator LAUTENBERG be given 30 minutes after the opening statements and the managers' amendments are offered on the military construction bill, so we can speak on the subject about which he has been speaking this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to, first of all, support enthusiastically the Trade and Development Act of 2000 known as the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

I thank Chairman ROTH, Senator MOYNIHAN, and the staffs for their hard work to retain the amendment I offered on child labor. This is an important piece of legislation not only for the trade benefits it promises to African and Caribbean countries, but for the benefits it promises to another important and often neglected group, the world's children.

This bill includes a provision I introduced last year in the form of an amendment when we first considered this trade measure. As many of you will recall, my amendment, cosponsored by Senators HELMS and WELLSTONE, sought to ensure that beneficiaries of U.S. trade preferences fulfill their commitments to eliminate the use of abusive and exploitative child labor.

My amendment passed the Senate by a resounding vote of 96-0. The provision contained in this conference report is very simple and straightforward.

It builds on the international consensus that came out of the ILO conference in Geneva last June in which the delegates unanimously adopted the Convention to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

This provision simply states that in order to be eligible for the trade benefits in this bill, the Generalized System of Preferences, the Caribbean Basin Initiatives, the African Trade Preferences, a country must implement its commitments to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as established by ILO Convention 182 for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor—it is that simple.

ILO Convention 182 defines the worst forms of child labor as all forms of slavery, debt bondage, forced or compulsory labor, the sale or trafficking of children, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict, child prostitution, children producing or trafficking in narcotic drugs, or any other work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety, or morals of the children.

This chart illustrates the ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, including child slavery, bondage, prostitution, use of children in pornography, trafficking in children, forced recruitment in armed conflict, recruiting children in the production or sale of narcotics, and hazardous work. These are all the items that are covered in the bill before us.

For the first time in history, the world will speak with one voice in opposition to abusive and exploitative child labor. Countries from across the political, economic, and religious spectrum—from Jews to Muslims, from Buddhists to Christians—came together to proclaim unequivocally that

abusive and exploitative child labor is a practice that will not be tolerated and must be abolished. Those are the exact words from the convention.

So after ILO Convention 182 was adopted unanimously, gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is an acceptable practice because of a country's economic circumstances; gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is acceptable because of cultural traditions; and gone is the argument that this form of child labor is a necessary evil on the road to economic development.

When this convention was adopted and approved, the United States and the international community as a whole laid those arguments to rest and laid the groundwork to begin the process of ending the scourge of abusive and exploitative child labor.

Additionally, for the first time in history, the U.S. tripartite group of the ILO, which consists of representatives from government, business, and labor, unanimously agreed on the final version of the convention. This is the first time in history this has happened.

For the first time ever in our history, the legislation we have before us—the African trade bill—will codify in U.S. trade law a simple notion: If you want the trade benefits outlined in this bill, you must implement commitments on abusive and exploitative child labor into which your country has freely entered.

Let me be clear. What I mean by abusive and exploitative child labor is not a kid helping on the family farm. It is not a kid doing work after school. There is nothing wrong with that. I worked in my youth. I bet you probably did too, Mr. President, as all of us did. That is not what we are speaking about.

The Convention the ILO adopted last year deals with children chained to looms, who handle dangerous chemicals, ingest metal dust, are forced to sell illegal drugs, are forced into child prostitution, are forced into armed conflict, are forced to work in factories where furnace temperatures exceed 1,500 degrees. It deals with children who are forced to work to pay off their parents' debts in a form of bondage that deserves to be called what it is, outright slavery.

According to the ILO, Latin America and the Caribbean has about 17 million children doing this type of work, Africa has about 80 million children, Asia has about 153 million, and there are about a half million in Oceania. That totals about 250 million children worldwide who are working—most full time. Millions of these kids are under 10 years of age. Some are as young as 6 or 7.

Can you imagine your first-grade son or daughter, or your first-grade grandson or granddaughter, working 12 to 14 hours a day in horrific conditions making just pennies a day, if anything? Can anyone say this is acceptable for any child anywhere in the world?

These children are forced to work many times with no protective equipment. They endure long hours, as I said, for little or no pay. They simply work only for the economic gain of others. They are denied an education and the opportunity to grow and to develop.

Again, this is in sharp contrast to any kind of a part-time job after school for spending money or to buy the latest CD. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about kids working in the worst conditions you can imagine. I am not talking about teenagers, I am talking about kids under the age of 10.

A lot of times, people will say: Well, that is just what you heard. But I have had firsthand experience and exposure to this.

About 2 years ago, Rosemary Gutierrez, of my staff, and I traveled to Pakistan, India, Nepal, and Bangladesh to investigate and look at the issue of abusive and exploitative child labor. We were in Katmandu, Nepal. We had previously been told of a young man who had worked as a child laborer for a number of years. He escaped, and through various and sundry means he became involved actively in working against child labor in his home country of Nepal.

Through various contacts, we contacted this young man and asked him if there was any way possible we could get in to see a carpet weaving facility where kids are working.

As others told us, the problem is, if you let a factory owner know you are coming to inspect, or to visit, they take all of the kids out the back door. They hide them. They disperse them around. When you get there, there are no kids. They do this all the time.

So the only way we could ever get a feel for what was going on was to surreptitiously and under cover try to enter one of these places. That is what my staff person, Rosemary Gutierrez, and I did with this young man from Nepal.

We got in an unmarked car. It was on a Sunday evening. He knew about this one plant on the outskirts of town where he knew one of the guards at the gate. He thought he had found out the owner of this factory was going to be gone. He knew the guard at the gate through I don't know what circumstances. He assured us, if he went out there, he would be able to sneak us in so we could see firsthand.

Imagine, we are in this unmarked car. My staff person, Rosemary Gutierrez, and another person, about five of us, I think, were cramped in this small, unmarked car. We drive out to this place on the edge of town, darkness has fallen. We walk up to this gate with an armed guard.

What is the first thing we see? A sign in both Nepalese and English. I took a picture of it. This is my picture. It says: Child labor under the age of 14 is strictly prohibited. Right there in front of the gate. It is in English and Nepalese.

Had we notified this plant owner we were coming, there would not have been one kid in this place. However, we came, the guard spoke with this young Nepalese man and let us through the gate. We walked down a back alley for about 15 yards, took a turn, and there was a building. We went in the door of the building that was all closed up. It is Sunday night about 7 o'clock in the evening. It is dark and wintertime.

We walk in the door and here is what we saw. This is only one picture, I have many others. This picture was taken by my staff person. That is me in the picture, I wanted to show proof positive of what was happening. Here are these kids. You cannot see them because the camera flash doesn't go back far. There are dozens of kids working at these looms. It is nighttime and kids are working the looms. Since I had this young Nepalese man with me who spoke Nepalese, they were talking. The kids were very nervous but I talked to this young child and the best we could determine he is 7 years old. We talked to this young girl shown in another picture and determined she was eight or nine years old. Remember, this is in the evening, they have been working all day in this closed building. I didn't know it at the time, but when you make these carpets, all the dust gets in the air; the place is dusty, anyone can see all the fine particles and the children have no protective gear whatever. We saw this firsthand.

To finish my story, it turned out the owner was not gone. After we had been there for about 10 minutes, the owner shows up and, of course, he is beside himself. I told him who we were and he asked us—not politely—to get out. Of course, we left—but not until we had the documented proof with photos. As I said, this is only one of many that I have. My staff person and a couple of other people were there to witness the kids, kids taken away from their countryside families. There was a barracks nearby where they live. They eat their meals there, they sleep there, they work here. This is maybe 50 or 100 feet away from the barracks in a compound which they cannot leave.

Tell me they are not slaves. They have no right to leave, they have no right to go home, they have no one protecting them. They are kept locked in a compound day and night, forced to work on these looms. Please, someone tell me that this ought to be tolerated in free trade.

This legislation before the Senate, the African trade bill, contains this provision that says from now on, no trade preferences to any country that doesn't implement what is already agreed to, implement the provisions of ILO 182.

Our goal is not to enact punitive sanctions on our trading partners. We are trying to use trade to help them emerge from poverty. Rather, it is to encourage and persuade them to build on the prosperity that comes with

trade and to lift their standards up. Exploitative child labor in other countries does a couple of things. First, it puts competing firms and workers at a disadvantage in the United States and other countries that do not allow child labor. This legislation before the Senate codifies for the first time ever in U.S. trade legislation the requirement that countries who wish to benefit from trade preferences must actually do what they have already committed to do, and that is to eliminate the worst forms of child labor.

Additionally, the Department of Labor will produce an annual report on what countries are doing in order to live up to their commitments to eliminate child labor. Furthermore, there will be a public hearing annually so that nongovernmental organizations, trade unions, and businesses will have an opportunity to comment. No longer will it be sufficient for a country to be merely "taking steps" to address one or more of the internationally recognized core labor standards to be deemed eligible for preferences under GSP or under the African Caribbean Trade Act.

Once the President signs this bill into law, a country's efforts to eliminate the worse forms of child labor will be a mandatory consideration for determining eligibility for trade benefits. This is, indeed, an important development. In the past, the U.S. Trade Representative, in its implementation and enforcement of the generalized system of preferences, I believe, has abused the language in the statute calling for taking steps to afford worker rights, including child labor. The USTR has interpreted that as any one gesture made by a country would be enough to satisfy the requirements of the generalized system of preferences.

In other words, there is a list of five internationally recognized workers' rights provisions: the right of association; the right to organize and bargain collectively; a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor; a minimum age for the employment of children; and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

If a country previously had taken a step in any one of those areas, they would get GSP. If they had the right of association but still had children working they could get GSP. This is wrong.

Now, after 15 years, we have a universal standard. ILO Convention 182 is a well-defined and internationally accepted standard that will be the criterion used in granting any country U.S. trade benefits. ILO Convention 182 will hold everyone to one real and enforceable standard already agreed to by 174 countries.

I believe in free trade. But I also believe in a level playing field. U.S. workers, workers in other countries, cannot compete with slaves. Call it what you want, dress it up with all kinds of fancy words, but these kids

are working under slave-like conditions, and they do not have a choice. That is the definition of slavery.

When a child is exploited for the economic gain of others, that child loses, their family loses, their country loses, and the world loses. It is bad economics and bad development strategy. Nations that engage in abusive child labor make bad trading partners.

A nation cannot achieve prosperity on the backs of its children. There is simply no place in the new global economy for the slave labor of children.

Again, I point out, this is the kind of work we are talking about. This is 8-year-old Mohammad Ashraf Irfan, making surgical instruments in Sialkot, Pakistan. He is working with dangerous tools and he is making surgical equipment. If you are going to go into a hospital and have an operation, you are probably going to have one of these used on you, made by an 8-year-old kid with no hope for his future.

Here is a young Indian girl carrying construction material. This is the kind of abusive and exploitative child labor we are talking about.

Recently, I came across a startling statistic. According to the UNICEF report entitled "The State of the World's Children, 1999," nearly 1 billion people will begin this 21st century unable to read a book or sign their name because they are illiterate. This is a formula for instability, violence, and conflict.

Nearly one-sixth of all humanity, 3½ times the population of the United States, will be functionally illiterate on the eve of the new millennium. That is shocking. And the main reason for this appalling situation is that many of these people who are adults now were forced to work as children instead of attending school.

The children making pennies a day and denied an education will never buy a computer or the software for it. They will never purchase a CD or a VCR to play American movies. By allowing abusive and exploitative labor to continue, we not only doom the child to a future of poverty and destitution, we doom future markets for American goods and services.

The markets of tomorrow are taking shape today. If we want American goods to be purchased the world over, people not only have to be able to afford them, they have to be educated enough to be able to use them.

Some have said labor issues should not be dealt with in trade measures. I think this is wrongheaded thinking. We should be addressing these issues on trade measures. After all, we are ultimately talking about our trade policy.

Not long ago, agreements on intellectual property rights were not considered measures to be addressed by trade agreements. In the beginning, just a few years ago, only tariffs and quotas were addressed by GATT because they were the most visible trade-distorting practices. But over the years, GATT evolved to include intellectual property rights and services which have be-

come integral parts of our trade agreements.

Now I understand the WTO, the World Trade Organization, will consider rules dealing with foreign direct investment and competition policy to be part of trade agreements. If we can protect a song, if we can protect a CD, certainly we can protect children.

We cannot, as a nation, ignore this. In 1993, the Senate put itself on record in opposition to the exploitation of children by passing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I submitted. In 1994, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, I requested the Department of Labor to begin a series of reports on child labor. These reports now consist of five volumes with a sixth to be released in a few days. They represent the most comprehensive documentation ever assembled by the U.S. Government on this issue.

Last year, President Clinton issued an Executive Order prohibiting the U.S. Government from procuring items made by forced or indentured child labor. I congratulate President Clinton for taking that step.

I am also pleased to say that the United States was one of the very first countries to ratify ILO Convention 182. We did it in near record time, and President Clinton signed this. I was there in Seattle at the WTO conference last December. Again, I compliment and commend President Clinton for his bold action in signing this, the U.S. being one of the first countries to sign on to ILO Convention 182.

I also compliment and commend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Chairman HELMS, for not only cosponsoring my amendment but also for his work in getting the ILO convention through his committee and through the Senate in record time last year. Chairman HELMS did a great service to this effort to eliminate these worst forms of child labor around the world. I commend Chairman HELMS for his leadership in this area.

I am not just talking about the ratification. I am talking about the standards that were established by this convention that were unanimously accepted in Geneva. There was not one vote against it. As I said, the Tripartite Advisory Panel on International Labor Standards says the United States already meets the standards set by this convention.

Last, some say this is a restraint of trade. Nonsense. We already have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of ivory. We have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of goods made with prison labor. We have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of counterfeit goods that don't respect intellectual property rights such as pirated CDs. Again, if we can protect ivory and pirated CDs, we can protect. I am pleased the United States has taken a major step forward with this trade bill. We are sending a strong message to our trading partners. There is no place in the global

economy for countries engaging in abusive and exploitative child labor.

I am hopeful my colleagues will support this conference report with an overwhelming vote. I believe this measure will give hundreds of thousands of children hope for a brighter future. As someone who has been working on this issue of abusive and exploitative child labor for over a decade, I cannot help but feel proud the United States has spoken in such a clear and unequivocal voice that engaging children in this type of slave labor will not be tolerated in our trade policy.

I yield the floor.

TEXTILES AND APPAREL PROVISIONS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, sections 112 and 211 of the act will create new import programs for apparel produced in the Sub-Saharan and CBI countries which have been carefully crafted to bring significant benefits both to those regions and to the U.S. textile and apparel industry if the new programs are administered as intended. These programs could, however, fail to provide the intended benefits if they are not administered as intended.

Obviously, the intent of the Senate managers in crafting the textile and apparel provisions in sections 112 and 211 is very important, and is worth discussing in some detail as we consider the conference agreement today.

I would now ask my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, if it is his understanding that the conference agreement adopted the operative provisions of the Senate bill commonly referred to as "807A" and "809" with respect to both Africa and the Caribbean Basin, provisions which afford duty-free and quota-free treatment to apparel articles made from American fabric.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. If the distinguished Senator from Iowa would indulge me further, with regard to the provisions popularly referred as "807A" and "809" in both the Caribbean Basin and Africa trade measures, do I understand correctly that the conference agreement adopted the operative language of these provisions as reported out of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. Is my understanding correct that those provisions, as reported out by the Finance Committee and passed by the Senate, required that all textile components of such apparel articles be made from American fabric?

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct. The Finance Committee reported out the Africa and Caribbean Basin measures separately. The committee reports on each of those measure addresses this issue explicitly. The reports make clear that those provisions commonly referred to as "807A" and "809" are to be administered in a manner consistent with the then-current regulations regarding the "Special Ac-

cess Program" for textile and apparel articles from the Caribbean and Andean Trade Preference Act countries. The report, in fact, expressly cites the Federal Register notice dated April 3, 1998, that sets out the rules that the Committee intended would apply. The language of the reports then restates the language of the Federal Register notice, concluding that the requirements that products must be assembled from fabric formed in the United States applies to all textile components of the assembled products, including linings and pocketing.

Mr. COVERDELL. When the Act requires yarn to be "wholly formed" in the United States, am I correct that the intention of the managers is to require that all processes necessary to convert fibers into yarns—i.e., spinning, extruding—be performed in the United States?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct. While the fibers need not be manufactured in the United States, let me be clear that it is the managers' intent that the man-made core of a wrapped yarn must originate in the United States and that all mechanical processes necessary to convey fibers into yarns must be performed in the United States.

Mr. COVERDELL. I understand that it is the managers' intent that under the Caribbean Basin portion of the Act, an apparel article containing elastomeric yarns, including elastomeric filament yarns, shall be eligible for the de minimis rule set forth in section 211 only if such yarns, whether covered or uncovered, are wholly formed in the United States.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. Now, with respect to the provisions of the Africa and Caribbean Basin programs that deal with fabric or yarn not widely available in commercial quantities, am I correct that it is the intent of the managers that these provisions should be administered in the same manner, as practicable, as the short supply procedures in the NAFTA?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is the case.

Mr. COVERDELL. With respect to the so-called "809" benefits the Africa and CBI programs, is it the intent of managers that apparel articles remain eligible for duty-free and quota-free treatment when the fabric is cut both in the United States and the beneficiary countries?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct, provided that all the other requirements of both the 807A and 809 provisions are satisfied. This includes the requirement that U.S. thread be used in the assembly of the apparel article.

Mr. COVERDELL. I have one final question regarding the so-called 809 provisions of both the Africa and Caribbean Basin measures. Am I correct that it is the managers' intent that these provisions do not permit dying or finishing of the fabrics to be performed in countries other than the United States or the beneficiary countries?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would like to thank my colleague for his time and attention to these important questions.

NON-ACCURAL EXPERIENCE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I would like to join my distinguished colleague from Tennessee in a colloquy with the distinguished Managers of this legislation, the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Virginia and I direct the distinguished Managers to a matter that relates to a revenue raising provision that was considered in the conference on the Trade and Development Act of 2000, but ultimately was not included in the final agreement. The revenue raising provision limited the non-accrual experience method of accounting.

The related matter is the application of the formula in the Treasury Regulations on the non-accrual experience method of accounting to qualified personal service providers.

The formula contained in Temp. Reg. Section 1.448-2T does not clearly reflect the amount of income that, based on experience, will not be collected by many qualified personal service providers, especially for those where significant time elapses between the rendering of the service and a final determination that the account will not be collected. Providers of qualified personal services should not be subject to a formula that requires the payment of taxes on receivables that will not be collected.

To this end, we believe the Treasury Secretary should amend the temporary regulations to provide a more accurate determination for such qualified personal service providers of the amount to be excluded from income that, based on the taxpayer's experience, will not be collected. In amending such regulations, the Secretary should consider providing flexibility with respect to the formula used to compute the amount of the exclusion to address the different factual situations of taxpayers.

Do the distinguished Managers agree with our view of the temporary regulations and the action the Treasury Secretary should take?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I agree with distinguished colleagues from Tennessee and Virginia that Temp. Reg. Section 1.448-2T presents problems for qualified service providers. Furthermore, the Treasury Secretary should consider amending these temporary regulations to provide a more accurate method.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I concur with my distinguished colleagues from Iowa.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, S. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000 Conference Report breaks important new ground in trade legislation. For the first time, in exchange for granting unilateral trade benefits to a country,

the President must give equal consideration to whether a country has met both trade criteria and labor standards.

For example, before the favorable trade benefits available in this legislation can be granted, the President must determine not only that a country has demonstrated a commitment to undertaking its WTO obligations on or ahead of schedule, and the extent to which a country provides protection of intellectual property rights, but also the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights.

Mr. President, I am pleased the Conference Report retained the Levin-Moynihan amendment requiring the President to take into consideration the extent to which a country provides internationally recognized worker rights, including child labor, collective bargaining, the use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and labor standards before the trade benefit can be granted to a Caribbean Basin beneficiary country.

The Levin-Moynihan provision sets an important precedent of promoting standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights as part of our trade relationships by considering progress toward those goals when unilaterally granting a trade benefit.

Most CBI countries are signatories of the International Labor Organization conventions. Considering the extent to which these countries abide by their own international obligations is the least we can do when considering whether they deserve to receive unilateral trade preferences from us.

The bill is further strengthened by another important precedent setting provision. The Conference Report also retained the Harkin amendment on Child Labor. As a result, this legislation, for first time, codifies in U.S. trade law ILO convention language on Child Labor by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that the ban on articles made with forced and/or indentured labor includes those articles made with forced and/or indentured child labor. It also, for the first time, conditions U.S. trade benefits on meeting child labor standards by adding a new eligibility criterion to the Generalized System of Preferences, which also apply to the eligibility criteria under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, to provide that the President shall not designate a country for benefits if it has not implemented its obligations to eliminate the worst forms of child labor.

I hope this legislation will help to bring about greater economic development and democracy to the important regions of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. Because of this hope, and because of the provisions I have mentioned above, I will vote for this bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 434, the Africa Growth

and Opportunity Act. I believe passage of this legislation is important to cement what has become the broad, bipartisan consensus of this body: trade is a key factor in raising living standards in developing countries, and is of primary importance in exporting to those countries key American values of human rights, democratization, peace and stability.

Mr. President, in supporting this legislation I do not suggest that trade alone is a panacea for the many difficulties in developing countries. Simply opening the door to trade with African countries will not enable many of these countries to enter the international community of developed nations. Many countries in Africa simply lack the basic health, education and economic infrastructures to take advantage of the benefits this legislation provides.

Trade and investment initiatives for Africa will not succeed without substantial investments in developing Africa's human resources.

For those sub-Saharan African countries who labor under a crippling debt burden, some measure must be taken to assist them to break free from reliance on debt provided by donor countries. Debt relief should be the highest priority of donor countries, including the United States, seeking to promote African economic development.

This legislation should therefore be hailed not as an end in itself, but as a good beginning to a longer-term policy which, under U.S. leadership, begins to draw Africa more closely into the global community. We need to begin now to ensure that U.S. policy will do more to promote regional economic cooperation and integration in Africa; U.S. Policymakers, including those in this body, should undertake broader and more regular consultation with Africa's governmental, non-governmental and private sector leadership, and we should ensure that the eligibility standards contained in this legislation carefully account for differing levels of development. To that end, we should be careful not to rely too closely on conditions such as those employed by the International Monetary Fund in applying eligibility standards under this legislation.

Mr. President, the importance of this legislation is both its historic significance as the first major piece of trade legislation in twelve years and its precedential significance in marking the importance of trade benefits as a "carrot" and not a "stick" to bring international social and living standards in developing standards more close to international norms.

Rather than holding this legislation hostage to concerns which can and must be addressed in the longer-term. I would urge my colleagues to take this first step on the road of a broader, more sensible policy toward the developing world, and pass this legislation.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that I will vote for pas-

sage of the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

No one can look upon the scenes of human suffering in Africa today without recognizing the need for action. Whether it is the AIDS epidemic or the violence in Sierra Leone, the floods in Mozambique or the unacceptably slow progress toward democratization, Africa challenges the conscience—and threatens the health and security—of the rest of the world.

We must respond.

The bill before us today offers an initial response to the many interconnected problems on the African continent. I agree with the basic premise of the bill, that promoting sustainable economic growth, led by more open access to American markets, must be a key element in any strategy for Africa.

And I must add here, Mr. President, that it is time for us to provide similar market openings to the nations of the Caribbean, who have faced a real disadvantage since the passage of NAFTA.

But I will focus my brief remarks today on Africa, because when the legislation before us today was initially proposed, it offered us the opportunity to formulate a comprehensive policy for Africa. At the end of the day, I am afraid that what remains is only a first step.

Mr. President, compared to the crushing problems facing the peoples of Africa, this bill is really very modest in terms of what it offers African countries in terms of duty free exports to the United States.

While opening our markets must be part of any program of economic assistance for Africa, we should not mistake this bill for a complete policy.

It may be that this bill has more symbolic value, as evidence of renewed interest in Africa, than any material impact on the many difficult and interconnected problems facing economic development there. Certainly, we should not let this bill become an excuse for self-congratulation or complacency.

Some provisions, however, I hope will enable the United States government to enhance its trade and investment relationship with countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The conference report directs the Administration to convene an annual trade and economic forum with the trade ministers of African countries. The key here is that in order to expand trade and investment, there must be a climate within African countries which create investor confidence.

I believe that open, face to face dialogue with African Trade Ministers is vital if the United States is going to get its message across about issues such as the importance of transparency, and the guarantee of timely remedy to disputes through a judicial process that is open and fair.

In addition, the report increases the number of foreign commercial service officers. Currently, we have fewer than 10 such officers for the more than forty countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Clearly this is inadequate. These officers are

responsible for identifying opportunities for small to medium U.S. businesses to export their goods and services to African countries, as well as providing information on economic conditions and investment climate factors which enable them to make better decisions on where and when to invest.

One of the most glaring weaknesses of this legislation, Mr. President, is that it does not adequately address the HIV/AIDS crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa, so eloquently described by Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator FEINGOLD yesterday in their moving statements.

Some of my colleagues do not believe that a trade bill should attempt to speak to the issue of HIV/AIDS. I believe that we are talking about a disease that is so virulent, so deadly and so pernicious that any plan for economic development in Africa will inevitably fail if this epidemic is not contained.

If only because of the very real threat that this epidemic carries for our own health and security, Congress must take any and all opportunity we have to provide help to this region in fighting this dreaded disease.

That is why, Mr. President, I was extremely disappointed that the Feinstein-Feingold amendment to the Senate bill was dropped without any provision put in its place which would offer effective assistance to Africans as they fight this deadly disease.

In March, the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously passed an authorization bill which provided \$300 million dollars for a program—based on work by Senators FRIST and KERRY—of vaccines to fight the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Although the conference on the bill before us today was conducted under the jurisdiction of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees, it declined to take action on the tax credits for vaccine research, production, and distribution that would have complemented those steps we took in the Foreign Relations Committee.

That was another opportunity lost, Mr. President, and another reason why the celebration over passage of this bill should be muted, at best.

I see some hope in today's Wall Street Journal, which reports that several major drug companies have announced plans to cut the cost of AIDS drugs in the developing world. I hope we will see some real results following from this announcement. Voluntary action of this sort can and should be part of any comprehensive plan to address this crisis of historic proportions.

This conference report also states that it is the sense of the Congress that the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa should receive substantial debt relief.

I must point out that the Foreign Relations Committee has passed authorizations for the use of the proceeds of gold revaluations at the IMF as well as the U.S. share of the trust fund that will be set up for the new, enhanced debt relief program for the poorest na-

tions of the world. The nations of Sub-Saharan Africa will be among the chief beneficiaries of that program.

I am glad to see that, with passage of this legislation, that Congress stands behind this debt relief program. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will soon provide the funds for us to put some money behind those sentiments, and that the Banking Committee will quickly conclude its work on the remaining authorization needed to put the debt relief program into motion.

In the end, while I understand and sympathize with some of the complaints raised by those who will vote against the bill, I prefer to see this glass as half full. But this is still a pretty small glass, Mr. President.

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in my absence I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD. As you know, I make every effort not to miss votes in the Senate, and would not do so but for the fact that there is currently a massive wildfire that is raging out of control in my state. At this time a substantial number of homes have been destroyed or damaged, with more surely to follow. And there is no end in sight. Thousands of New Mexicans have had to leave their homes in Los Alamos and White Rock, and if the conditions stay the same there, many more will be leaving in other communities. This is a uniquely catastrophic situation, and I apologize for not being able to cast my vote.

But since I cannot be here today, I want to submit for the record that if I was here I would have voted in the affirmative for the Africa/Caribbean Basin Initiative Trade Bill. There has been considerable debate over this bill, and I have carefully considered the issues involved. I agree with my colleagues that this is not a perfect bill—questions concerning labor rights, human rights, corporate investment, the environment, transshipments, and so on linger, and they will do so until the provisions of the bill are implemented over time. But I am convinced that over the long run it begins a process that offers real hope for Africa, the Caribbean Basin, and the people who live in those regions. So while I am not present today, I state for the RECORD that I feel this is the right step to take. An initial step to be sure, but definitely the right one. •

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, more than 6 months ago I signified my support for the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Initiative when it came to the Senate floor for a vote. Today, I stand again with a bipartisan collection of my colleagues, a broad base of industry, faith-based and religious groups, a variety of free trade advocates, and supporters from the sub-Saharan African nations and the Caribbean to advocate for swift passage of this legislation.

To begin, Senators ROTH and MOYNIHAN should be applauded for producing and delivering this legislation

after more than three years of deliberation and negotiation. The long and arduous task of attaining agreements between U.S. industry and their counterparts in Africa and the Caribbean, as well as assuring that the various trade interests from all sides were accommodated, is a task that should be commended.

As we continue to prosper and advance in this expanding and ever changing world economy, it is essential that the United States reach out to all regions of the globe. By unilaterally expanding access to U.S. markets, sub-Saharan nations and the Caribbean will be afforded new trade and investment policies that will propel these regions into 21st Century trade practices.

Trade with the United States does imply that certain practices be instituted and embraced by participating nations. This bill promotes the establishment and development of free-market economies, insists on human rights standards, and champions democratic and economic principles, the U.S. expects from our trading partners.

From textiles and apparel, to agriculture and specialty goods, not only does the United States stand to prosper from this trade agreement, but, so too do the sub-Saharan and Caribbean nations. While some have argued that U.S. companies could be harmed by expanded trade with these regions, stringent requirements regarding the transshipment of goods have been incorporated into the legislation. In addition, the bill includes a provision that enables the U.S. Customs Service to assist these countries with illegal transshipments.

While I am somewhat disappointed that the bill no longer includes the reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance and the Generalized System of Preferences, the crux of the bill, its intent, and its long-term impact on trade with sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean make it well worthy of passage. In addition, my home State of Washington, the most trade dependent state in the nation, naturally stands to gain from increased trade.

Again, I reiterate my support for the legislation and its far-reaching intent. With such a broad base of advocates vying for its passage, not to mention the partnerships in trade this legislation creates for the United States, this measure deserves our support and swift approval.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concerns with the legislation before us.

While I support the intent of this legislation, increasing trade between Africa and the U.S., I will not be able to lend it my support.

This is in no way a comment on either Chairman ROTH or Senator MOYNIHAN. They have done yeoman's work on this legislation, which has been a longtime priority for them both.

Mr. President, my objection to this legislation is what it includes, and what it excludes.

The legislation includes provisions which are a less than comprehensive approach to establishing mutually beneficial trade relations with Africa. In addition, I have heard from Rhode Island textile manufacturers who remain concerned with the textile provisions in this legislation, specifically the less than perfect transshipment elements. Lastly, the legislation only includes a study of the effectiveness of Trade Adjustment Assistance, even though the Senate bill reauthorized and strengthened TAA for workers and businesses adversely affected by international trade.

On the other hand, the conference report excludes an amendment which is important to our country's jewelry manufacturers as well as Senator FEINGOLD's and Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment on HIV/AIDS treatment in African nations.

Last year, with the support of Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN, the Senate adopted a common sense amendment to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act to improve country of origin marking requirements for certain types of imported jewelry.

Now, improving the country of origin marking requirements for jewelry may seem like a modest proposal, but it took many years to develop a compromise on this issue that would pass the Senate.

To give a sense of how long it took, I first introduced this legislation in 1996 as a member of the other chamber, when members of our struggling domestic jewelry manufacturing industry came to me with a desire to see permanent country of origin markings on imports.

These small businesses told me that all too often the stickers or tags meant to inform consumers where a product was made, fell off, were obscured by price tags, or in some cases were simply removed. Customs officials in Rhode Island also acknowledged that there was a problem with the marking regime on imported jewelry.

Most importantly, I found that the same concern on the part of domestic makers of Native American style jewelry had been addressed as part of the 1988 trade bill. It is upon this common sense law that I based my legislation.

Mr. President, as a general rule, the United States requires all imported products to display in the most permanent manner possible the nation where they were made. One only has to look at a watch, clothing, computers, televisions, scissors, books, toys, and almost every other product to see that its country of origin is conspicuously and permanently marked so consumers know where a product was manufactured.

The existence of these marking requirements is not due to some nefarious protectionist urge, rather it is simply a tool to provide consumers with information and help Customs officials easily recognize imports for the purposes of tariff classification. I

would add that most of our trading partners have similar standards.

It was with the above in mind that I was pleased to work with the Chairman and Senator MOYNIHAN to develop a sensible amendment to increase the amount of imported jewelry that had to be permanently marked. However, I would point out that this language was also consistent with all trade laws and created no bar to the flow of imported jewelry. Moreover, the amendment did no more than establish marking requirement parity between non-precious jewelry and Native American style jewelry. And, lastly I am hard pressed to see how changing the method by which a product is marked leads to any increased costs for foreign manufacturers, since under the current country of origin system all products are legally required to be marked in some fashion.

Unfortunately, the House cavalierly dismissed the concerns of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, and California jewelry makers for reasons of either ignorance or animosity to change.

I want to stress that I appreciate and recognize the time that the Chairman, Senator MOYNIHAN and their staffs put into this seemingly non-controversial provision.

While the legislation before us does not contain this common-sense amendment, I want to assure my colleagues here and in the other body, as well as the thousands of hard-working men and women of the domestic jewelry industry, that I will continue to pursue this issue and utilize all of the Senate's prerogatives to enact this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. This legislation contains important measures that not only will help spur the economies of developing nations in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean Basin, but also will strengthen our ability to retaliate against countries who refuse to comply with WTO trade decisions won by the United States.

Sub-Saharan Africa is enmeshed in great economic, human, and political turmoil. The countries of this region are among the poorest in the world. The per capita income averages less than \$500 annually, and the average life expectancy is the world's shortest. We have all seen pictures of the desperate conditions—images of starving babies, homeless families, and needless bloodshed seem to be everywhere. And, just today, news stories about the situation in Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe remind us of how truly bleak life in Africa can be.

But, Mr. President, despite the killings, despite the political unrest, despite the poverty—the future offers the people of Africa great opportunities for increased trade and investment—opportunities that can restore hope and bring about positive change on the Continent.

With a population of more than 700 million, Sub-Saharan Africa represents

one of the largest economic markets in the world. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, my own home state of Ohio was the tenth largest exporting state to the region, with \$148 million in exports in 1998. Although U.S. exports to Africa are more than 45 percent greater than U.S. exports to all the countries of the former Soviet Union, this export market still represents only about one percent of our nation's total trade.

It is time that we establish a new economic framework on which we can build increased trade with Africa. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act establishes just such a framework by encouraging increased trade and investment by reducing trade barriers.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the legislation before us today, not only affects African nations, but also those within our own hemisphere through the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

Over the last decade, the United States has played a vital role in the spread of democracy and the growth of free enterprise throughout the Western Hemisphere. Today, every nation in our hemisphere—except Cuba—has moved toward establishing a democratic government and is opening their economies to free trade. Democratic elections have become the norm—not the exception—and hemispheric trade integration is a common goal.

To further consolidate democracies and economic gains in the region, we must move forward to integrate economically with our neighboring countries. The Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act is part of our effort to consolidate democracy and economic stability in our hemisphere. This Act would bring tremendous benefits to the United States and to the Caribbean Basin. It would enhance our economic security, both by opening new markets for American products and by strengthening the economies of our closest neighbors. And, it would create new hope for those left jobless by Hurricanes Mitch and George.

The CBI enhancement legislation would extend duty-free treatment to apparel assembled in the Caribbean Basin (or assembled and cut in the region) using U.S. fabric made from U.S. yarn. This would help strengthen existing U.S.-CBI partnerships in the apparel industry, because the duty-free treatment will help U.S. apparel manufacturers maintain their competitiveness with the Asian market.

The CBI enhancement also would take steps toward creating a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), by promoting the anti-corruption and protection of intellectual property, as well as other forms of cooperation with matters such as counter-narcotics programs. Specifically, the legislation would link CBI benefits more explicitly to the fulfillment of specific obligations in beneficiary countries in such areas as WTO compliance, intellectual property rights, investment protection,

market access, worker rights, narcotics enforcement, corruption, government procurement, customs valuation and comparable tariff treatment.

Mr. President, trade integration will occur in this hemisphere, whether or not we are a part of it. So, it is in our national interest to shape that integration process by bringing more countries into bilateral and multilateral trade agreements with the United States. If we fail to seize trade opportunities in Africa and within our own hemisphere, others will take our place of leadership. No country is waiting for us to act first. In the end, the longer we wait, the more we stand to lose.

And speaking of losing, currently, our nation continues to be injured by the refusal of the European Union (EU) to comply with WTO rulings in the beef and banana trade disputes. In addition to denying American farmers access to the European market, the EU's actions are undermining the entire WTO Dispute Settlement process. If they are successful in ignoring such decisions, how can we expect other countries to follow trade dispute settlement rulings? How can we expect anyone in the United States to have faith in the WTO?

Repeatedly, I have come to the floor to raise my concerns about the EU's flagrant disregard for dispute settlement rulings in the beef and banana cases, which have clearly shown the "Fortress Europe" mentality against free and fair trade. Last Fall, during the Senate floor debate on the Africa trade bill, I successfully amended the legislation to create a powerful mechanism—tariff retaliation—to fight "fortress" mentalities and to protect our nation from illegal foreign trade practices. Today, I am pleased to say that the conference report before us now still contains my provision to strengthen the one and only weapon in our arsenal to fight WTO noncompliance.

The purpose of the provision is simple—to make our retaliation more effective and to compel compliance with the WTO rulings. The measure would specifically require the U.S. Trade Representative to periodically "carousel"—or rotate—the list of goods subject to retaliation when a foreign country or countries have failed to comply with a WTO ruling. The retaliation list would be carouselled to affect other goods 120 days from the date the list is made and every 180 days, thereafter. The U.S. Trade Representative would retain ample discretion and authority to ensure that retaliation implemented by the United States remains within the levels authorized by the WTO. Also, the provision makes it clear that our Trade Representative is to structure the retaliation lists to maximize the likelihood of compliance by the losing side in trade disputes.

Mr. President, the WTO is one of the most important means for American businesses and producers to open foreign markets, liberalize commerce, resolve disputes, and ensure more open

and fair trade. American farmers and agribusiness, for example, are major net exporters, posting exports of more than \$57 billion in 1997. Of the nearly 50 complaints filed by the United States in the WTO, almost 30 percent involved agriculture. If a country or countries fail to comply with WTO rulings, American agriculture and other U.S. sectors in need of trade relief will suffer greatly.

It's time to fight back. While carousel retaliation is tough, it is the right response to chronic non-compliance with WTO rulings. It is the kind of response that will do more to encourage compliance with WTO rules, giving Ohio's farmers and businesses the level-playing field they deserve.

Overall, Mr. President, the trade bill before us is a good bill—it is good for Sub-Saharan Africa; it is good for the Caribbean Basin; and it is good for agriculture and business right here at home in the United States. In the end, this bill just makes good sense.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support passage of H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. This legislation includes the African Growth and Opportunity Act, legislation to grant Caribbean countries tariff parity with the North American Free Trade Agreement, and other legislation that will use trade incentives to promote U.S. global economic interests.

I have been a longtime supporter of many components of this legislation, especially the African Growth and Opportunity Act and legislation giving NAFTA parity to our Caribbean allies. This legislation sets an important precedent for future U.S. foreign policy by emphasizing trade incentives over foreign aid. It makes clear that a developing African or Caribbean country must pursue democratic and market-oriented reforms in order to receive benefits. This incentive-based approach will promote democratic government and economic reforms among nations home to more than one billion people. Recent developments in both Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone show that there is much work that still has to be done in Africa to establish stable and effective political and economic institutions. My hope is that this legislation will encourage these developing countries to continue to make progress toward this important goal.

This legislation has been improved since it passed the Senate last year. The conference report gives greater incentive to the development of local African and Caribbean industry by allowing conditional duty-free treatment of apparel made from regional fabrics. While I hope that a future Congress will remove the restrictive conditions on this tariff treatment in order to more fully assist the development of regional industry, I believe that this liberalized tariff-rate quota will promote economic growth and stability in the affected regions. This legislation urges the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and Export-Import

Bank to promote investment in Africa. Greater American investment in Africa creates greater exposure to American political, economic, labor and environmental principles. Provisions of this legislation also welcome the people of Albania and Kyrgyzstan into the international economy, which I believe is beneficial to American interests. Finally, I am glad that this legislation includes a provision to prohibit the importation of products made from child labor into the United States. This barbaric practice is a relic of earlier, less enlightened times that should be extinguished.

It is unconscionable that the conference dropped a provision that would have made HIV/AIDS medicine more available to the African people. The AIDS epidemic throughout Africa is a crisis, which impedes political reform and economic development in that region. We have a moral obligation to help relieve this health epidemic. I am a strong advocate of free trade and private enterprise. However, as a practical matter, there is little profit to be made or lost in assisting with a health crisis in poor undeveloped countries. Therefore, I believe that we should have included the Senate provision in order to ensure greater distribution of HIV/AIDS drugs to Africa. Since it is no longer included in this legislation, I urge the Congress to enact legislation that will establish a comprehensive solution to the HIV/AIDS problem in Africa that includes the greater distribution of American drugs and medical practices to combat HIV/AIDS. The AIDS crisis in Africa must be solved if we are to achieve any lasting development in the region.

I also have concerns that this legislation will establish some poor precedents. It is my understanding that there is not yet a formal estimate by the Congressional Budget Office for this legislation, so we do not know its cost. I am very disturbed that whatever the costs of the legislation, it will be paid for out of the federal budget surplus. This is not wise policy. The Constitution clearly gives the Congress the "power of the purse" and we must use this power judiciously. I remain dedicated to the principle that the Senate should only consider legislation that has both a known cost and specific provisions paying for it. The version of this legislation that we considered in the Senate in November included provisions to pay for it. The Congress should close tax shelters and loopholes and cut wasteful government spending in order to pay for new programs. As fiscal conservatives, we know that this surplus exists only because we have made careful choices. We must now use this surplus to shore up Social Security and Medicare, pay down the national debt, and cut taxes—not spend it on more government programs.

I am also concerned by some of the provisions in this legislation. While I understand that the current tariff

structure puts American suit manufacturers at an unfair advantage, remedying this inequity deserves more study by the Senate. I do not favor the tariff rebate provisions. No compelling argument has been made to support a Wool Research, Development and Promotion Trust Fund that costs \$2.25 million each year. I am also concerned by provisions included in the conference report that allow Oregon nuclear power plant workers to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance benefits after their eligibility has expired, and allow a company with operations in Connecticut and Missouri to obtain a refund on duties it paid on imports of nuclear fuel assemblies. In addition, I have reservations about using "budgetary gimmicks" to change the schedule of payments of rum excise taxes to Puerto Rico. These revisions are unrelated to trade opportunities for Africa and the Caribbean. All of these measures should be examined in the usual authorization process to ensure that they are considered on merit, and not foisted on the taxpayers by special interests.

In conclusion, although I disagree with some of the inadvisable provisions in this bill, I support this legislation. I believe that, on balance, it is an important milestone in American policy with the developing world, which I hope will encourage the spread of American political and economic values. I will not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. However, Congress should ensure that we are more fiscally responsible in funding legislation. It is important that we write responsible legislation that will help promote the American principles of democracy, the rule of law, and a market-oriented economic system.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is an exceptionally difficult decision.

But after weighing the pros and cons of this legislation, I rise to support the Trade and Development Act.

It is high time that we address economic growth in Africa and the Caribbean. Africa, in particular, has been ignored for far too long. I would like to support this effort to encourage economic growth, investment and trade in the region while recognizing that this effort alone is not enough. It should only be a small piece of our policy in Africa. Much more must be done.

I have considered the impact this measure will have on American workers. I am a blue-collar Senator. My heart and soul lies with blue-collar America. I spent most of my life in a blue-collar neighborhood. My career in public service is one of deep commitment to working-class people. I have fought and continue to fight for economic growth, jobs and opportunities in America—in particular—in my own State of Maryland. And in the last decade, working people have faced the loss of jobs, lower wages and a reduced standard of living, and a shrinking manufacturing base—everything that the critics say. But voting against the

Trade and Development Act will not save those jobs or bring those jobs back.

I also care about working-class people all over the world. I applaud my colleagues for uniting to pass Senator HARKIN's amendment to meet and enforce internationally recognized standards that eliminate the worst forms of child labor. Countries can only enjoy the benefits granted under this Act if they take action to eliminate work that harms the health, safety or morals of children. Benefits will not be given to sub-Saharan or Caribbean countries that carry out hazardous child labor practices, such as slavery, debt bondage, forced or compulsory labor, child prostitution or drug trafficking. This effort is especially relevant to this trade legislation because out of the 250 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 who are working in the developing world—one-third are in Africa.

This Act could have been further strengthened. I supported other amendments toward that aim, which were not incorporated into this legislation. I see several yellow flashing lights that we cannot ignore and we must address with our trading partners in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

Even though the worst forms of child labor were addressed in this legislation, additional efforts still need to be undertaken to protect the rights, welfare, health and safety of all workers. I supported amendments offered by my colleagues to ensure the enforcement of internationally recognized core labor standards and to establish a labor side agreement before this legislation could go into effect. Neither amendment was adopted.

Furthermore, much more needs to be done to protect our environment. Dangerous or haphazard practices that damage the environment in sub-Saharan Africa or the Caribbean not only harm territory within these regions—it affects all of us. We cannot continue to ignore the environment in trade agreements. We must find a way to ensure that economic growth does not come at the expense of the environment.

In addition, much more must be done to provide debt relief to Africa and to prevent and address the HIV/AIDS crisis plaguing the region.

Taking into account these considerations, I still believe that we have a unique opportunity to support legislation that works toward free trade and fair trade. This Act strives to create economic growth, jobs and opportunities in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. It encourages African nations to compete and to institute market-oriented economic reforms. It also works to strengthen America's economy and to create American jobs by increasing US exports and investment to these regions.

I agree that the Trade and Development Act as it stands does not encompass numerous other measures that America needs to undertake with re-

spect to Africa and the Caribbean. But it is a courageous first-step and it merits our support.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report on H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. I oppose this bill because, as a result of this legislation, many Americans will lose their jobs, a significant number of whom will be South Carolinians. Our domestic textile industry will be particularly damaged. I remind my colleagues that in the past five years over 454,000 American textile industry workers already have lost their jobs.

At best, this bill further erodes the system of protective quotas that the Administration promised the U.S. textile industry as a condition of U.S. entry into the World Trade Organization. This quota system was to remain in effect for ten years from 1995 until 2005, to provide the U.S. textile industry with time to adjust to competition from foreign government-subsidized and sweat-shop made textile imports.

The textile industry has been strong in the United States because it encompasses fiber, fabric, and apparel production. The textile industry, in the aggregate, forms the second largest industrial sector of the U.S. economy. Certain segments of the industry, such as yarn and fabric production, have benefitted from technology and increased capital investment while apparel production has tended to opt for cheaper labor rather than invest in modern production facilities.

I fear this bill will further encourage U.S. textile firms to move their production off-shore. It signals capital markets that the U.S. textile industry is at risk, thus reducing its ability to borrow the capital to make those improvements necessary for domestic production. With the denial of capital to automate and modernize, the rush toward cheaper and cheaper labor will lead to a continuing exodus of U.S.-based manufacturing. This will result in a further loss of employment in the domestic textile industry and its supporting industries.

A decline in the domestic textile industry will also impact American farmers. Cotton producers in the United States have profited from a strong and vibrant domestic textile industry. However, as the textile industry becomes locked in a downward spiral of chasing ever lower costs, it will look for other ways to reduce expenditures. A likely result will be to encourage cotton production closer to its foreign manufacturing facilities. While U.S. cotton exports may initially increase under this legislation, the long-term impact will not be so favorable to domestic cotton producers.

The countries of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean do need to develop economically. There can be no doubt that these countries require help. However, providing assistance by decimating the U.S. textile industry is not the answer. Furthermore, there is no

assurance that this bill will improve the textile industry of these Nations or provide jobs to their citizens. It is clear that government-subsidized Asian textile interests are positioning themselves to dominate the world textile trade. One only has to look at the situation in the Northern Mariana Islands to see the model for the future. Moreover, transshipment to evade the quota arrangements of this bill and other existing quotas will likely continue until the quotas finally end in 2005.

Mr. President, H.R. 434 is a bad bill that critically injures the U.S. textile industry, puts Americans out of work, and, in the end, benefits only Asian textile interests. Therefore, I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, due to a scheduling conflict I was unable to cast my vote today on the cloture motion for the conference report accompanying H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. For the record, I would have voted "aye" in favor of cloture on the bill.

I am very supportive of expanding our trading opportunities with the Caribbean countries and Africa and I am delighted that all parties involved have come to agreement and we have passed this vital legislation. Our distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, focused our attention on the significance of the passage of this bill earlier today when he highlighted the fact that this is the first trade bill to pass Congress in six years. In my view, that is simply too long.

I'm not here to focus on missed opportunities today, however. I'm here to praise the members of both the House and Senate who were on the conference committee for their tireless efforts on this bill's behalf. To all involved in the passage of this legislation I say "thank you."

This legislation means a great deal to the Caribbean and Africa, but it means a lot to Arkansas, too. This bill will generate an increase in demand for cotton, which is sorely needed. Our cotton farmers at home have experienced several years of bad weather and prices, and I know they are pleased to have access to new markets. It's planting season in Arkansas but that hasn't stopped my constituents from staying in touch. I've heard from many of them this week who took time from their busy schedules to voice their support for this bill. They realize, as I do, that the world is increasingly becoming a "global marketplace" and we must do all we can to expand our trading opportunities. I applaud the Senate's vote on the "Trade and Opportunity Act" today and hope that it will not be another six years before the next trade bill comes to the Senate floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the trade bill before us represents a milestone in U.S. trade policy. This bill, and especially the African Growth and Opportunity Act found at Title I, acknowl-

edges the social, health, and political problems as well as the economic challenges facing a group of states, most of which are developing nations.

It is not that our trade policies have not concerned themselves with developing countries before—that commitment is evident in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and many other trade initiatives. However, this bill is unique in many ways.

First, we are acknowledging that the mere existence of a trade agreement does not produce immediate results. The strength of a society and its polity profoundly affect the development of the capabilities that allow for globalization. Developing countries, for example, need investment, but prudent companies do not commit their resources unless some very fundamental conditions exist, conditions that exceed those addressed in the Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS) Agreement of the World Trade Organization.

The bill before us does that. We underscore the importance of political stability; we provide opportunities for technical assistance that can create a banking and legal structure to repatriate profits and to protect the sanctity of the contract.

Second, we acknowledge that there are regionally specific social and health issues that are preconditions to real economic development—what I refer to as "trade enablement." Most Sub-Sahara African (SSA) states have been left behind. Their colonial and post-colonial societies have not, for the most part, melded into a modern, unified state. Nor have these societies produced the type of workforce that trade demands—educated, technically skilled, and healthy workers.

The bill before us deals this reality, too, and in several ways.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe we should do what we can to help restore our African partners to the world baseline standard of good health. With 20-30 percent HIV/AIDS infection among the adult populations in some states, few firms will risk hiring a workforce in which one-in-three to one-in-five workers may not be alive, let alone working in five years. I agree with President Clinton's comments that Africa, too, needs to do more to control this problem. But this bill provides incentives.

Not only are these efforts to improve health in this region good economics and good politics, but they are also simply the right thing to do. We are the richest nation in the world. It has always been a part of the American character to help those who are suffering and to improve conditions where we can.

Worker education also faces immense challenges. Literacy rates have risen to 59 percent, but that level lags comparable literacy rates in East Asia (84 percent), Latin America (83 percent) and the Caribbean (83 percent). Once

more, the incentives provided by this bill to create an investment climate, will awaken African governments to the need for programed improvements in literacy and technical training. And, through the newly created economic forum under this bill, conditions can be put in place for technical assistance.

Mr. President, it is undeniable that this bill is a hybrid. It is not a conventional trade bill, because Africa, with the exception of a few states like South Africa, Gabon, and Mauritius, is not positioned to gain immediate or even mid-term benefits unless, and I repeat, unless, trade is coupled with the forms of assistance and incentives that this bill provides.

But it is no less deniable that great benefits will be potentially available to both the U.S. and Sub-Saharan Africa if the underlying concept in this bill materializes.

For the United States, Africa is a warehouse of badly needed strategic materials which will open new sources of supply for U.S. producers. Moreover, if properly developed, this market will benefit the entire population of an African state, rather than a few, often corrupt elites.

It is a fundamental axiom of every trade theory that the economic evolution of trading partners produces rolling prosperity—which is another way of saying that prosperity raises all boats. Not only does this phenomenon promise future markets for U.S. goods, services, and agricultural products, but also a more prosperous, politically stable African continent, which, in turn, produces other foreign policy and national security benefits for the U.S. It creates international partners in this region that have a stake in world peace, disease controls, as well as other initiatives to combat terrorism, international crime, labor force abuses, and environmental degradation.

I believe that this Africa Trade bill will have a broad range of benefits for America, and I will support this legislation. I want to compliment Senator ROTH, Senator GRASSLEY, and other Senators who worked so diligently on this legislation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last year I reluctantly cast my vote against the Trade and Development Act of 1999, a modest package of trade bills which included the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act.

I have long supported expanding trade opportunities for Vermonters and all Americans, as well as for people in developing countries. And I have felt for some time that our relationship with Africa cannot continue to be based almost exclusively on aid, when the real engine of development, as we have seen both at home and abroad, is investment and trade.

However, I voted against that bill because I felt that in developing a trade policy toward Africa—where poverty is deeply rooted and protections for the environment and the rights of workers

are non-existent—precautions must be taken to ensure that it is a sound policy that responds to Africa's unique and urgent needs. I was disappointed that given the rare opportunity to examine and redefine our relationship with Africa, the approach was so limited and flawed.

There are many aspects of this conference report which I strongly support. Provisions which open new markets for American exports, while providing trade benefits that will help a number of countries compete more effectively in the global economy. Provisions which encourage countries to eliminate the worst forms of child labor, and raise the profile of U.S. agricultural interests in trade negotiations.

I remain disappointed, however, by the act's approach toward Africa.

It is astonishing that aside from Sense of Congress language about the need to strengthen efforts to combat desertification, the act in no way addresses environmental concerns. This is an unfortunate step backward from NAFTA, which—while they did not go far enough—contained side agreements on both environmental and labor issues.

Multinational corporations, especially mining and timber companies, have a long history of exploiting Africa's weak environmental laws and causing pollution, deforestation and the uprooting of people. There is a direct link between environmental degradation and civil unrest. If barriers to foreign investment are lowered or eliminated—as the act calls for—and meaningful, enforceable environmental protections are not put in place, these problems will only get worse.

The act's provision on workers' rights, most of which have been included in other trade legislation, have routinely allowed countries notorious for abuses to escape without penalty. Unions have rightly criticized them for being vague and unenforceable.

As the wealthiest nation, we have a responsibility to do what we can to ensure that the benefits of the global economy are enjoyed by people from all walks of life, here and abroad. However, the workers' rights provision in this act are an invitation for the continued exploitation of cheap African labor.

Mr. President, some have claimed that this legislation is an historic first step toward integrating Africa into the global economy. Others have called it a devastating blow that will force African countries to cut spending on education and health care, and to submit to strict International Monetary Fund conditions. It is neither.

The Trade and Development Act of 2000 is not going to cause the great economic boon some have predicted, and it may cause harm. But it is the wrong approach if we truly want to redefine our relationship with the region from one of dependency to one of actively promoting economic growth and self-reliance.

Like last year, I reluctantly cast my vote against the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have now reached the final stage of the legislative process with regard to the Trade and Development Act of 2000. The moment has come to vote on final passage. Once again, I urge my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for opportunity, to vote to reaffirm America's historic leadership in international trade. What we do here, what we say here, reverberates all around the world. So I say to my distinguished colleagues, let's send a resounding message, a clear message, a strong message, that America is engaged with the world. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

I hope we will have speakers now on the African trade bill so we can move ahead to get a vote on that. I think I have not had any requests for speakers in support of the legislation because those of us who support the legislation would like to move it to immediate passage. I hope those who would still like to speak in opposition to it and express those points of view will please do that at this particular time.

In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are going to go to a vote immediately. All speakers on this side have evaporated. They will present statements.

We do have one speaker, Senator FEINGOLD of Wisconsin, who wants to speak for 45 minutes. I ask unanimous consent he be allowed to speak on this bill on which we are going to be voting following the vote, and prior to military construction, for up to 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 98 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Abraham	Gorton	Mack
Akaka	Graham	McCain
Allard	Gramm	McConnell
Ashcroft	Grams	Mikulski
Baucus	Grassley	Moynihan
Bayh	Gregg	Murkowski
Bennett	Hagel	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nickles
Bond	Hatch	Robb
Breaux	Hutchinson	Roberts
Brownback	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Burns	Inhofe	Santorum
Campbell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Schumer
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Coverdell	Kerrey	Shelby
Craig	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Durbin	Levin	Torricelli
Enzi	Lieberman	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lincoln	Warner
Fitzgerald	Lott	Wyden
Frist	Lugar	

NAYS—19

Boxer	Edwards	Reid
Bunning	Feingold	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Helms	Snowe
Cleland	Hollings	Thurmond
Collins	Kennedy	Wellstone
Conrad	Leahy	
Dorgan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Bingaman	Domenici
Bryan	Roth

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this was a momentous moment for the Senate, for the Nation, and for the world. We have passed the first trade bill in 6 years, having rejected others and having come about in the aftermath of very dim expectations. From no chance whatever, we have come to the point where this bill passed by 77 votes. It could not have happened without the majority leader, who personally convened meetings in his office day after day. There were mind-numbing details about thread, yarn, square meter equivalents, hundreds, millions—but it came about.

Senator ROTH, our chairman, who could not be here today, will be back next week. He put this matter through the Finance Committee nearly unanimously. I would like to take the opportunity to thank the staff who not only did this, but did it until dawn, day after day—or should I say night after night. They are, on the majority staff: Frank Polk, Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad, Tim Keeler, and Carrie Clark. On the majority leader's staff: Dave Hoppe and Jim Hecht. On our minority staff: David Podoff, Debbie Lamb, Linda Menghetti, and Timothy Hogan. Plus majority and minority tax staffs because tariffs are taxes, we had: Mark Prater, Ed McClellan, Russ Sullivan,

Cary Pugh, Anita Horn, and Mitchell Kent. And a very special word of thanks to Polly CRAIGHILL, Senate Legislative Counsel, who labored with the committee staff long into the night.

Once again, I say to my dear colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, who carried the matter so brilliantly on the other side, not every day do we pass a trade bill 4-1. Thank you. And I again thank the majority leader. The Nation is in his debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, following up on what Senator MOYNIHAN just said, and associating myself with those remarks, as important as the bill we passed is for the continent of Africa and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and as important as it is for the consumers of America and the 120,000 new jobs it is going to create for American working men and women, this bill is far more significant, from my point of view, because it is the first major piece of trade legislation passing the Congress in years, as Senator MOYNIHAN said.

In the meantime, I think the United States has been seen by other nations as giving up some of our traditional leadership around the world in negotiations and tearing down trade barriers, which has been our role as a world leader since 1947. I hope that this legislation is the start of America, once again, leading the world in reducing barriers to trade, the promotion of international trade, and seeing trade as more important than aid as an instrument to helping depressed economies around the world.

I look forward to the continuation of our leadership in setting the agenda for the World Trade Organization agenda and regional trade agreements, as well.

Besides all the staff members Senator MOYNIHAN mentioned, I also compliment my international trade counsel, Richard Chriss, on his outstanding contribution to the passage of the Africa Trade and CBI bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I also thank the majority leader. I am not a member of the committee, but I wanted to commend the Senator from New York once again for his tremendous leadership on this issue, and Senator GRASSLEY who is filling in for Senator ROTH, who will be back next week. I commend the majority leader and minority leader. This is an example of what this body can do on issues that usually provoke the most bitter debates. Trade policy and some other issues can be tremendously acrimonious. The fact that the leadership on both sides of the aisle worked as diligently and as hard as they did to try to come up with some understandings as to how to recognize legitimate interests speaks volumes about what this body can do on something as significant and as important as this bill.

I didn't want the moment to pass without commending, obviously, the floor managers and the Finance Committee for their work, but also the leadership for their support of this measure. The administration, as well, should be mentioned in this context. While it has been 6 years, we are going to be dealing with a couple of these issues now in sequence that will be very important and, obviously, their backing and support is worthwhile.

Regarding the last point our colleague from Iowa made, my hope is that passage will also serve as a springboard for us to deal with other foreign policy matters that serve the interests of our country. We have entered a global economy. We all know the lingo about the kind of world of which we are now a part. It is going to be critically important that the Senate of the United States is fulfilling its historic role—the unique aspect of the legislative part of Government—to be engaged in the foreign policy interests of our Nation.

This agreement certainly serves the interests of Africa and the Caribbean Basin very well. But more importantly, it serves the interests of our Nation very well. So I commend the staff and others who were involved. This is a great start. The leadership deserves commendation for their support and their willingness to put a shoulder behind this effort. I also thank the minority leader, TOM DASCHLE, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator DODD, and Senator GRASSLEY, for their comments. They are absolutely right. This is the way we can do things when we make up our minds that we are going to. Keep in mind that just a year ago, most people thought this had no chance. The House passed a bill that was only applicable to Africa. But then Senator ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN said we should go forward on this. They made the point that we had not had a major trade bill in—I thought 5 years, but in fact it was 6 years. I yielded to the distinguished Senator from New York because he pays such close attention to this. The chairman and ranking member said we should go forward with this and we should add the CBI region and Central America to the package. We did that.

We worked together across the aisle between the two parties. The administration did express its interest in this legislation. The President personally called at least twice—maybe three times—and talked about his hope that we could get this done. But I remember a critical moment a month or so ago, late at night, and we were trying to make the last decision that would close the package up. Dave Hoppe, my chief of staff, was there, and Jim Hecht on my staff, who worked so hard on this legislation, who knew the substance better than I would ever know it. It is mind-boggling in its detail and all the pieces that were in this package. But when I had to basically help make the

final decision, as a matter of fact, I was looking at Senator MOYNIHAN's staff and said, "What do you think? Can we make this work?" They said, "Yes."

That is the way it was. It wasn't partisan at all. To reach this point now and have a vote in the House last week of 309-110, and then 77-19 in the Senate, in an area where we have acrimony, regional division, and one sector of the economy pulling against the other, I think this is something we should take a moment and relish and take credit for and be proud of. It represents a significant step forward in our trade policy and a victory for the cause of free trade. Like Senator DODD, I have been to Central America and met with the Presidents and Ambassadors from Central America and the Caribbean. They pleaded for this and said, "Give us an opportunity." This is the way to help. This is the way to help their people and give them an opportunity to get jobs. It will help you, and it will help us.

I suspect there will be a celebration today and tonight in Central America, in the Caribbean, and in Africa.

I want to make this point. While that is important, we want free trade and this is good for America. I worked a great deal with CHARLIE RANGEL, the Congressman from New York, who really wanted this. I remember a fateful meeting we had outside an elevator in the Cannon Office Building at which I said, basically, if you do Africa, we will do CBI, and we will get together. And we did. He said in some of our meetings: I don't want a bill that is going to cost America jobs. I believe we can have a bill that helps America, creates more American jobs and more opportunity for Americans, and that will be good for the sub-Saharan region and for Central America. I believe we achieved that.

This bill retains the basic structure and approach of the original Senate bill. I want to emphasize that because we made a commitment to Senators who had reservations about this bill that we would do everything possible to retain the basic structure of the Senate bill. We fought for it, and I think we were successful in that area.

The approach makes economic sense, allowing workers and businesses in this country and in our trading partners' to specialize in the activities to which they are most suited. The vast majority of the trade benefits under this bill will involve the use of U.S.-made components. They need it in those other regions. They need our yarn. They need our cotton. So we will benefit, and they will benefit.

I am acutely aware of the concerns and challenges facing our domestic textile industry. Faced with vast amounts of unfair trade and blatant cheating in past textile agreements, our industry has seen a flood of foreign imports that have caused job losses.

The U.S. textile industry will within a few years face the removal of quotas under WTO. At a time of such uncertainty, it is imperative that our trade

measures be carefully geared to sustain and enhance the economic opportunities available to our textile industry and workers. I believe this measure before us today does that. It has some of the most stringent transshipment measures ever enacted, increasing resources for the Customs Service and ensuring that countries receiving benefits under the bill provide full cooperation with our authorities.

That was one of the concerns—that other countries would use Africa, or the CBI, the back door, to transship, to violate the agreements and get in our country in an unfair way.

Will this be perfect? Nothing in this area is perfect. But it will do the best job I believe we have ever done. We are going to watch it to make sure it is effective in that regard.

I was pleased to see comments from members of the domestic textile industry as a result of this conference agreement. The president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute has noted projections that the demand for U.S. fabric will double over the next 8 years under this bill. It is estimated that this will translate into more than 60,000 new U.S. textile jobs in America. This legislation will have real benefits, immediate benefits—for American consumers, for the retail industry, for the yarn industry, for cotton, and for textiles. All the other components in this area of job creation in America will benefit. So will Africa. So will the CBI.

I am pleased we have come to this agreement. Actually, it is a little anticlimactic. In the end, the vote was so overwhelming that you wonder why all the huffing and puffing. But I believe it is because of the good work done by our staffs and by the leadership in the House and in the Senate. It would have not been achievable if Chairman ARCHER and subcommittee chairman CRANE had not been willing to be flexible and agree to some of the things that were important to the Senate.

I want to say a special word about our staffs that worked so hard, and through so many nights, to secure the successful conclusion we have seen today. I want to recognize in particular Senator ROTH's staff, including Frank Polk, J.T. Young, Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad, Tim Keeler, and Carrie Clark; and from Senator MOYNIHAN's staff, David Podoff, Debbie Lamb, Linda Menghetti, and Tim Hogan; from Senator GRASSLEY's staff, Richard Chriss; and from the Congressional Budget Office, Hester Grippando. And finally, with a bill of this detail and technicality, the diligent work of legislative counsel is especially critical. I would like to thank Polly Craighill, Sandy Strokoff and Mark Synnes for their extraordinary efforts.

So, Mr. President, I do not want us to complete this effort without saying I am proud of it. I believe it will be positive for all concerned. I began the debate that way, and I end it that way.

I extend my congratulations to all involved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I compliment the majority leader for his statement and for the effort he has put forward in bringing us to this point.

I agree with virtually every word he has just spoken about the importance of this matter and about the extraordinary influence it will have on trade policy to important parts of the world today. This is not only good trade policy, it is good economic policy, and it is good diplomatic policy. It is extremely important that people realize the diplomatic, economic, and trade ramifications of this legislation.

I have watched with great admiration as this legislation has been produced. I must say it is one of the many reasons I have come to admire our ranking member on the Finance Committee and his extraordinary effort in getting us to this point. I don't know that I have talked to him about any matter as often as I have talked to him about this in recent months. This is one he has lived and breathed. We are very grateful to him for his leadership and for all of the work he did to get us to this point.

I have already expressed myself in regard to the importance of the legislation and the extraordinary amount of effort that has gone into the work today. This would not have happened were it not for the involvement of a number of our colleagues. Its importance cannot be overemphasized. This is good for this country, and as I noted, it is important we recognize the new opportunities that it presents, not only for the Caribbean countries and Africa but for this country especially.

I would be remiss if I were not to mention the tremendous leadership demonstrated by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD. On every issue involving Central and Latin America, our caucus depends upon him to a remarkable degree. He is, without a doubt, our expert on South America, on Central America, and on international issues. I personally find myself required, in many cases, to turn to him as the person in whom I have the greatest trust and for whom I have the greatest admiration when it comes to his knowledge of these issues. I thank Senator DODD for all of his efforts in getting us to this point.

I also thank Senator GRAHAM from Florida who has put a great deal of effort into the vote we were able to get this morning, and I am grateful to him.

Finally, Senator BAUCUS also has worked diligently with all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and is also extraordinarily knowledgeable on trade matters.

We have a number of our colleagues who, because they worked as hard as they did, because they showed the leadership they did, because they were as committed as they were to resolving

outstanding differences and working through these many issues in a way that allowed us this success, we ought to pause and thank today. It is not often we see legislation, and trade legislation in particular, of this import with the kind of vote we just cast. It is a great day for this country. I again publicly express my appreciation for their diligence and for their work in getting us to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator FEINGOLD is recognized for up to 45 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

We just completed our work on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I had the opportunity on a number of occasions during the debate to express my concerns about the bill and, in particular, the way in which it did not address one of the greatest crises in Africa—the HIV/AIDS problem. But I have asked for this opportunity to speak about another enormous problem in Africa that I think needs to be closely associated with the debate we just had and our thinking with regard to Africa; that is, the problems with armed conflicts in Africa.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers or watching television in the last few days—whatever the medium—could not help but have a natural reaction to the news from Africa that would suggest an impression of chaos, and even feelings of hopelessness. I am sure this is especially true in the last few days when it comes to the events that are transpiring in Sierra Leone with some United Nations troops being killed, others apparently captured, some missing, protesters being killed, and the absurdity of the United Nations troops protecting Foday Sankoh, the leader of the Revolutionary United Front, the group that has been responsible for some of the most heinous crimes against people we have seen in many years—a group that has been responsible for repeated acts of murder, maiming, and rape. People see this on the television, read about it in the newspaper, and they wonder if there is anything that can be done to help make things different in Africa.

Then they read about Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and they have this sense, understandably, that is a place of endless conflict. They read about Ethiopia and the starvation and famine in a border dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea that seems to be, at least to many of us, unnecessary and terribly harmful to the people of both countries. They turn on the television, and they see Zimbabwe and what must appear to be a form of chaos with people occupying the land of other people and farmers and farm workers being murdered in a place that a lot of people thought was a success and that now begins to look awfully tense, violent, and undemocratic.

Add to that what we have been talking about in the last few days with this enormous AIDS crisis. Then, if you

mention the AIDS crisis to somebody from Africa, they say: By the way, do you know there is a terrible new strain of malaria that has become extremely problematic and dangerous for people in many parts of Africa? So it is easy for anyone to react with resignation.

I think this is a compassionate country. I think our elected representatives wish to help. When all of this is viewed, I fear that people believe it is hopeless. I think that is understandable. But it is too easy to give up or to use well-worn phrases to dismiss the situation in the African countries as hopeless.

We hear that a lot of records are thrown away. We hear people say, for example, that is just "tribalism" and that is what happens when these tribes strike out at one another.

Another word used is, well, it is just "barbarism." That is what goes on in Africa, people seem to say, and there is nothing you can do about it.

Others point out quite clearly that there are problems with corruption in many of these countries. One very thoughtful Senator actually said to me the other day as we talked about what might be done to try to resolve the problem in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Well, I am afraid we are just going to throw away money to make ourselves feel better.

That is what some people fear we do when we try to solve or help solve the problem in Africa.

I don't think anyone can entirely dismiss any of this. As one who has on occasion shared at least the emotional reaction to these phrases and terms, I am afraid these terms and attitudes reflect a generalization about all of Africa, about the entire continent, that does not hold true. In fact, they are generalizations that even with regard to some of the specific examples do not have a connection to reality. I think these generalizations sometimes suggest, and these phrases sometimes suggest, an unwillingness to explore and understand the differences that actually exist as between these African countries and situations, and in fact the differences between easy assumptions and the facts on the ground in any one of these individual places.

I understand how easy it is for someone to slip into a feeling of hopelessness about Africa. I fight it myself in my own experience. Having been in Africa in December for 2 weeks and having traveled to 10 different countries, I have had some moments such as this. Since I have been there, in the countries I actually had a chance to visit, the situation certainly has not vastly improved, as in the Congo—although I will be talking about that shortly.

In Rwanda, there has been some political instability, a change of power in the Presidency, and other disturbing events. Namibia, just below Angola, has been drawn, to a greater extent than they had been in the past, into the Angolan conflict that has been going on for about 25 years. This has been only since last December, with

refugees crossing border lines in significant numbers. In Angola itself, this brutal civil war continues. You may have seen tragedy in some of these other countries on the television. One of the most horrifying things you could ever see is the incredible tragedy of war and the refugee children in Angola.

Then, of course, Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe certainly seemed tense in December. I was concerned. President Mugabe seemed quite tense to me at the time, but I had no idea there would be this collapse of a commitment to democracy on the part of the President of Zimbabwe, and all the violence and fear that has resulted.

Add to that places I did not go this time. There was a coup d'etat in Cote d'Ivoire. Some say it was for the better in the long run, but a coup d'etat it was. And we have also seen the terrifying and tragic consequences of flooding in Mozambique.

Even in Nigeria, which I would cite as a place where we have some greater hope than we used to have, even there where a fledgling democracy is trying to take root, there are repeated examples of religious and geographically based violence that make it difficult to believe the future is going to automatically be a bright one.

So I feel all these concerns about these problems, having just been there and traveled to some of these countries. Oddly enough, though, I believe we have to struggle to simultaneously do two things. First, we have to see each of these situations as different instead of just generalizing. Second, at the same time, we have to see the interrelationships between the different situations in Africa and the different countries in Africa. Because if we do not see how these situations relate to each other, we will not be able to help to make stability and peace possible, and we will not be able to help with fighting disease and establishing democracy and fighting corruption.

I do not pretend to come close to understanding all of these interrelationships, but I am trying to assist our own analysis of what American foreign policy toward African nations should be.

Let me suggest, at the risk of oversimplification, a few distinctions between three different important situations in Africa that we have been reading about right now: Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Zimbabwe. They are very different. First, Sierra Leone is obviously a very small country compared to the others, apparently about twice the size of the State of Maryland. The situation in Sierra Leone is certainly more confined than the situation in the Congo, but it does involve other elements. A lot of the refugees from Sierra Leone have gone to Cote d'Ivoire, which has led to some destabilization there.

The leader of Liberia, Charles Taylor, has been heavily involved in backing Mr. Sankoh in Sierra Leone, and has caused problems backing the RUF organization that committed so many of

these crimes. Unlike so many other African countries, Sierra Leone recently, in the last few years, had their first real democratic election. The President was thrown out in a coup, then the ECOMOG, the Nigerian-led force, came in and put him back in power. But the country descended into this, one of the most brutal civil wars we have witnessed in many years. So the Sierra Leone situation is a very tenuous governmental situation. There is no long, continuous period of rule, either democratic or otherwise, by one particular power or entity or person.

Contrast that with the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Congo is, obviously, a huge country. To give you an idea of the size, it is basically the size of all of the United States, from the Mississippi River all the way over including the entire east coast. It is that big in area. But it has not suffered so much from instability, except for in the last few years, as from a brutal rule of Mr. Mobutu who, for maybe 35 years, was the autocratic ruler of what was then called Zaire and who, in fact, some regarded as one of the greatest thieves of all time, in terms of all the resources and riches he spirited out of his nation of Zaire which is now called Congo.

Finally, Mr. Mobutu had to flee and a group of powers from around Africa, some of whom are fighting each other now, together helped establish President Laurent Kabila in power a few years ago.

So it is a terribly difficult situation, but it is not the same as Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone is a frightening situation. There are great crimes being committed. But what is happening in the Congo quite a few people have referred to as a world war, or Africa's first world war. It is that significant and that problematic.

In fact, many people do not realize it but there are so many countries that now have their troops fighting in Congo that it really does look like a world war. There are alliances. For example, one side of combatants that are supposedly allies—although they have been fighting amongst themselves some—are Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi. They are backing the rebels trying to fight the Kabila government. On the other side, you find groups from Angola, Namibia, and Zimbabwe trying to support and keep in power Mr. Kabila.

In addition to that, we fear there are economic incentives for some of these countries to want to stay in Congo. It is a country rich with incredible resources, including diamonds. Some suggest some of these countries may not want to leave the conflict because of the economic opportunities that exist. So, I would have to say Congo is already like the ultimate Rubik's Cube in foreign policy; it is so complicated and difficult, in terms of understanding what is going on and what could be done. It is like a world war.

Now, contrast that with the third example, Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe is in a

very different position. Zimbabwe actually had what, fortunately, became about 20 years ago, majority rule. Although I obviously believe that the previous Rhodesian Government was a terrible government, some of the institutions from that era have continued into the current era and suggest at least a significant commitment in the past to reasonable governance and the rule of law.

Unfortunately, that promise and that hope that Mr. Mugabe originally brought have fallen apart. Many people think what is happening in Zimbabwe is a race war; that is not the case. It is not a war of black against white. Some think it is about land reform. Although certainly there should be some land reform, that is not what is happening in what used to be a country that some thought was moving in the right direction.

What is happening in this country—that basically was on a better path than Congo, and certainly a better path than Sierra Leone—is President Mugabe is not moving his country forward in a democratic way, in the way that the great Nelson Mandela did. Nelson Mandela, one of the greatest persons of the 20th century, after all those years of imprisonment, became the President of South Africa. What did he do after his first term was up? He believed it was important that democracy work, and he stepped aside and let someone else be elected President. This is just the opposite of what Mr. Mugabe is doing in Zimbabwe, which is threatening to destroy, in my view, a country that has great promise.

I am trying to illustrate how different these situations are. Why do I do this? We must consider our responses to each of these crises individually, as well as in the context of Africa as a whole. When we look at each one, as well as any other situation in Africa, I can understand the hesitation on the part of the American people and our elected Representatives. Hesitation is not only understandable, but it makes some sense.

I understand the need to be hesitant. Hesitation should not be born of oversimplification or incorrect generalization. I know why we are hesitant to get involved in too many places. I have personally said many times we are overcommitted around the world. We have over 250,000 American troops stationed abroad in this post-cold-war era. We have gotten ourselves in situations in Bosnia and Kosovo and in East Timor and even in Colombia, potentially, that some people would regard as open-ended. I am more optimistic about the East Timor situation. However, I am fearful that in Bosnia and Kosovo we got into a situation very heavily. It is open ended. We may find it difficult to extricate ourselves. That is a reason for hesitation.

There are reasons for being hesitant specifically with regard to the record of the efforts made in Africa in the past. Certainly, the failure of the U.N.

mission in Congo in the early 1960s is an example often cited as an attempt that failed that makes people hesitant. Without any doubt, the miserable failure of our Somalia mission in north-east Africa in 1993 and 1994 is another example of where the American people would have some reason to pause before wanting to get involved in helping to resolve some of the conflicts in Africa.

I think this hesitation begs the question with regard to Africa. I think the question is, Why do we act decisively in other parts of the world, and seem to be disproportionately hesitant to act when it comes to problems in Africa? There are a lot of reasons that might be given for treating Africa differently. Let me suggest I don't think these reasons hold up. I want to mention a few of the reasons that have been given or might be given.

First, our not acting in Africa cannot be because of a lack of tragedy, brutality, and even genocide in Africa. Despite the cries of "never again" that were legitimately raised with respect to Bosnia and Kosovo and even East Timor, how can anyone now use that kind of phrase with regard to what happens in Africa? I don't need to cite chapter and verse from my colleagues, although maybe I should, about the tragedies and brutality and human suffering in Africa as a result of conflict, be it Angola, Burundi, or, of course, Rwanda.

I don't think the reason we don't act in Africa is because the African countries should try to help themselves. The fact is, the African countries are doing a pretty good job with very limited resources to try to shoulder their share of the burden. In fact, they compare favorably to our European allies when it comes to stepping up to the plate in their own region.

One of my criticisms of the Bosnia and Kosovo situation is I don't think the European allies did as much as they could and asked us to do more than we should in those situations. There are examples, in Africa, of a better record. Nigeria, a country I have often criticized on this floor, under their previous military regime actually has a good record of trying to resolve conflicts in their region. The ECOMOG forces, led by Nigeria, were involved in trying to change the situation for the better in Liberia, and the Nigerians in the past have taken aggressive steps to try to solve the problem in Sierra Leone, and some hope they will be asked to do this again.

When I was in Mali in December, one of the poorest countries in the world, they told me how some of their people were part of the ECOMOG force that went into Sierra Leone, and how they lost eight lives in that mission. They are taking the loss of lives of their own citizens in the name of trying to have peace and stability in their region. I am impressed by that.

I am impressed by the comments of President Chiluba of Zambia this week-

end who, after a couple hundred of his troops were missing in Sierra Leone, said he regretted it. He was concerned for their safety, but peace was worth this kind of effort.

For anyone who thinks the African nations and the African Presidents are asking us to do everything, that is not what the record shows. I don't think it can be a fair objection to our acting and a reason for hesitance to say they are asking for American troops to do this. That is not true. I am not hearing demands for American troops. In fact, I talked to ten different African Presidents about the Congo situation in December, and I don't remember any of them asking for American troops to be involved in this situation. In fact, some did specifically seem to indicate they prefer that there not be American troops involved for whatever reason. This is not a question of whether American ground troops will be asked to resolve these situations.

I don't think our hesitance can be explained by suggesting that African situations are somehow too complex—though, as I indicated they often are complex—to try and unravel. Some of the situations are horrible but are relatively straightforward, such as Angola. And as I said, although Congo is complex, so, certainly, are the situations in Bosnia with the ethnic divisions and borders that show no particular relationship to the ethnic identity of the people. There are little enclaves throughout the area. We are talking in this Congress about getting more involved in the situation in Colombia with real money and real resources. That is an enormously complex situation which is related to the situation in other Latin American countries. So it can't simply be that these are tough nuts to crack; they are, but they are not the only ones. We have acted in some incredibly difficult and complex situations in parts of the world that are not in Africa.

Can it be because somehow Africa doesn't involve our national security? I don't think it can be that these situations are not dangerous, not only for Africa but for us and the rest of the world. The situation in the Congo is often called Africa's first world war, as I have said. That means not just tragedy for Congo and the nations directly adjacent, but it means it has the potential for enormous disruption throughout the entire continent, and I suggest a destabilizing influence throughout the world when it comes to the spread of AIDS, when it comes to millions of children who are orphans, when it comes to child soldiers marauding around the countries, and, yes, national security because this kind of situation, if left unchecked, opens the door to other countries and other entities that are not our friends, trying to exploit the tragedy in Africa, whether it might be attempted by Libya, North Korea, or perhaps China. It cannot be that we hesitate because this continent

is not in our national interest and is not a question of our national security.

Finally, perhaps most important, our hesitation cannot be because the United States and the West have no responsibility to act. Consider the colonial legacy. After my trip, I had a chance to read one of the best and most powerful books I have read in a long time called "King Leopold's Ghost" by Adam Hochschild. This is basically the story of the brutal exploitation of the Belgian Congo by Belgium's King Leopold and others in the previous century. Colonialism essentially marauded the social structure of a peaceful people.

When that period finally came to an end in 1960, I believe, they had a democratic election. I am sure it was not perfect, but a man named Patrice Lumumba, a hero to the Congolese people, was elected President. A few months later, he was brutally murdered, without a doubt at the instruction of our CIA and our country. That is what we did to the people of Congo, and we installed Mr. Mobutu who proceeded to have one of the most brutal rules in history for the next 30 to 35 years.

To suggest we do not have a responsibility, that we did not have anything to do with this is just plain wrong. The same thing goes for Angola. This is not about the colonial era only. Angola was used for many years as a playground for the cold war. The Soviet Union and the United States decided to have it out here, and they planted more landmines in the fields, the rich farm fields of Angola, than any other place in the entire world. As a result, there are more amputees in Angola than anywhere else in the world and in any other time in human history. Walk down a street in Angola and look at the number of people who have lost a limb to landmines—not that lives, of course, were not taken. It is appalling. That was our war. I understand the stakes that were involved, but to suggest we do not have a responsibility when we were that involved in the situation and to fail to help the people from Angola to have a decent life is simply wrong.

I have just given six reasons that I do not think can really be the reasons for our not acting in some of these situations. I will now suggest three reasons I think might genuinely explain our extreme hesitance and reluctance to help stop these conflicts in Africa, as compared to our willingness to do it in other parts of the world.

First, I believe there is a genuine fear that we will get stuck in one of these situations. Some might call it the Vietnam syndrome, and I understand that, having been a young opponent of the Vietnam war myself in my college years. I remember the song entitled "Knee Deep in the Big Muddy." That was a symbol for our generation of how we were stuck in Vietnam. I am sure many people worry about that.

I submit we are already stuck in Bosnia and Kosovo, and I believe we be-

came stuck in those places because we went headlong into those conflicts with no good plan about how to finish it or what resources we would commit to it or what steps would allow us to finish the job or decide that we cannot finish the job. I do think that our hesitance is part of our very recent memory of the enormous tragedy in Africa in Somalia when we lost 18 of our brave soldiers in the helicopter disaster that led to our withdrawal. There is no question in my mind that Americans and American foreign policymakers worry that if we try to help in one of these situations, we will get stuck and cannot get out. When I say "we," I mean the international community, not necessarily just the United States.

Second, I think we do not act perhaps when we should because we have a tendency in this country to think in terms of having to do all or nothing in one of these situations; that we have to do the whole thing, and if we do not do the whole thing, somehow we have not lived up to an American obligation to do absolutely everything to solve the problem.

Some say do not do it at all unless you are going to go in and get the job done. I have heard that many times with regard to military intervention; why don't we just go in there and finish the job? It is an attitude which, on occasion, is appropriate but I think sometimes leads to mistakes.

When it comes to the African situation, this notion that we should do everything or nothing leads to real problems. In Somalia, we tried to do too much when we did not know what we were doing, and then we did nothing when it came to Rwanda. It does not have to be everything or nothing. In fact, there is a recent example I am relatively pleased about, and that is what we are doing in East Timor. We are not leading the charge there. Australia is leading the charge and Asian countries are leading the charge. We are helping in a measured, reasonable way because the countries in that region, as I suggest some of the countries in Africa, are trying to do the same thing.

I believe that is a reason people are afraid of doing some things because they want to do everything or nothing.

A third reason we do not act, and a genuine reason—and I fear it is the most important reason and I wish I did not have to come to this conclusion—but I do think there is somehow, unbelievably, a double standard when it comes to Africa. This is very bad for Africa, and I submit it is just as bad for the United States.

When I see President Mbeki of South Africa and the President of the People's Republic of China, Jiang Zemin, get together at a news conference and comment about how they are tired of having one country calling all the shots in the world, I see fertile ground for resentment against the United States that can hurt us today and can especially hurt America and our children and grandchildren in the future.

This is a sad thing to let happen because we do not have a lot of the colonial baggage and some of the resentment that Africans feel toward countries such as Belgium because we were not deeply involved in many of those situations. We have a positive opportunity, when it comes to much of Africa, to get it right.

It is this idea of getting it right that brings me to the specific purpose of these comments, and that is that we should not summarily retreat from the pursuit of peace and self-determination in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I fear there will be some kind of a knee-jerk reaction because of the very disturbing news and film coming from Sierra Leone. The United Nations there obviously has not yet got it right. I may well be interested in seeing and helping that United Nations effort become stronger and tougher to deal with the brutality that is going on, and we cannot abandon that situation, but I believe there is a way to get it right in Congo. One of the main reasons is the leadership of a man from whom I stole the phrase "Get It Right," and that is our Ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, whom I had the chance to accompany on a trip to Africa in December. It was an honor to be on that trip, and we had a chance together to meet with virtually every one of the African Presidents who are directly interested in this conflict.

I want my colleagues to know that, although we were extremely moved and troubled by the AIDS crisis in Africa, and that overtook us emotionally on the trip, the core reason for the trip was to see if the Ambassador and I and others could get an understanding of the complexity of what is going on in the Congo and what we could do about it.

I want my colleagues to know—and I heard him do it—that at each stop, Ambassador Holbrooke said: We want to help, but there are no blank checks and we must get it right or we cannot help.

He was very measured and showed due caution. Of course, the situation in the Congo is incredibly difficult, but I see some reason to see it as progressing in the right direction, slowly but surely. I understand that our support may not necessarily work, that there could be a failure, but I think that serious logical steps can be taken.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to, just very briefly, indicate some of the steps that have been taken in the Congo pursuant to what is called the Lusaka agreement that suggests to me this is a situation worth supporting if at all possible.

The countries involved, including the Congo itself, and some of the rebel groups, have signed this Lusaka agreement that set up something called a

joint military commission. This joint military commission is committed to doing the job of actually enforcing the peace and making sure the parties withdraw from the other countries.

In order to get to phase 2 of this operation that is now contemplated, a number of things had to happen. The joint military commission had to be created, and an initial 90 observers from the U.N. had to be deployed. That was done. But before the next phase goes forward—the one that involves some 5,500 U.N. troops and personnel—a number of other things had to happen as well.

There had to be a functioning cease-fire. Although it has not worked at all times—and at the moment is in a little bit of trouble because of the conflict between Uganda and Rwanda—on the whole, it has succeeded in the last month. Second, it was essential that all these parties come together and pick one person as a facilitator of the process of national dialogue. After a number of efforts, they did so, by appointing President Masire, the former President of Botswana.

They had to create an operational arrangement of the U.N. MONUC group and the JMC to coordinate, and they did it. They had to have a signed commitment by the parties of the conflict guaranteeing security and freedom of movement and access for the U.N. team. And they did it.

So now we come to the point of where additional steps, hopefully, can be taken. We are now looking at getting into the second phase of this peace operation, including developing plans to disengage and withdraw the troops from the various countries and parties that have signed this agreement, and the conducting of an inter-Congolese dialog that could lead to a genuine democratic country, and to develop these plans with the JMC.

If that is accomplished, and only if these steps are accomplished, would we go forward to the final steps, phase 3, which involves verifying the withdrawal of foreign forces, normalizing border security, and, yes, finally, again, after all these years, the conducting of a democratic election.

So what I am seeing here, although it is certainly not perfect, is a measured step-by-step approach—not an all-or-nothing approach—but a step-by-step approach, led by the African countries. That is something I think we should encourage and even admire because it is so very difficult to do in this situation.

For me, there is a sufficient record to say, we must try to do something—not send U.S. troops, not send a huge United Nations force of 30,000 or 40,000 people, as some have wondered about.

It may not work, and we may ultimately have to say no to doing more, as tragic as failure would be—but based on the facts that I have witnessed and learned about, I think we must try.

We must not wash our hands of this or just say that it would be an example

of throwing money in the Congo to make ourselves feel better. I believe we should support financially—and in other ways—the efforts for peace in the Congo. We must try.

Again, why must we try? I think because this is a test—it is a very tough test—but it is a test of whether the United States really does have a double standard vis-a-vis Africa. To abandon the Congo without an effort would be a strong signal that we intend to abandon all of Africa.

We must try, even though we have tried in other situations with great difficulty—such as Kosovo and Bosnia and Haiti. Let me again suggest I think we went too headlong into those situations. I do not think we were careful to take the measured steps that are being done in this case. And that led to our complete, abject failure to act with regard to Rwanda. As I have said, even with regard to Somalia, mistakes were made. But I think that is because it was, again, an example of an all-or-nothing approach, with no clear mission, and no exit strategy.

I think this is different. I think this has the potential to work, although it is difficult, because it is measured and it is an African-dominated approach.

I think we have to try because at this time in human history the crimes against Africa have to be halted. I do not have time to talk about the slave trade, the gap between the rich and the poor, the use of these countries as a playing field for colonial powers during the cold war. But we cannot extol this new global economy and trade around the world and have these African nations treated forever as hopeless and fundamentally different.

We must try, in fact, because the lofty rhetoric of U.S.-Africa trade becomes something of a cruel hoax on the people of Africa if we are not going to confront the brutality, the chaos, and even the genocide in the very nations with whom we claim we want to have improved trade.

We must try because I think it truly hurts America in the world's eyes, at a critical time in our role as a world leader, if we are perceived as being unwilling to help African nations when they desperately need that help.

Finally, to return to my initial theme—because each situation in Africa is different, and yet interrelated—if we help move this process forward, this Lusaka agreement, involving cooperation between the U.N. and the joint military commission, it cannot only give Congo what it has always deserved and never had—real peace, self-determination and hope—but it can help its neighbors.

Rwanda is greatly destabilized and threatened because of this conflict in the Congo. Uganda has a very problematic border with the Congo, and other countries, and is now in conflict with Rwanda because they are in the Congo together. That would help alleviate that situation. Burundi has enormous problems of its own, which President

Mandela is trying to help with. None of these countries should be involved in the Congo conflict. They have problems of their own.

Angola, which I have described as one of the most horrifying situations in Africa, should not be having troops up in this area for whatever reason, perhaps because of their conflict within their own country. We can cause this to be a more localized problem that perhaps we could deal with.

Namibia certainly should not have troops up in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, nor should the other countries, when all it does is drain their resources and causes problems over their borders.

And, of course, Zimbabwe. Talk about any country in the world that should not be using its resources right now to fight a war in the Congo, when it has such desperate economic and political problems at this time. Even South Africa suffers in its tremendous struggle to become one of the great nations of the world as long as this Congo conflict continues.

Let us be realistic, but let us also be open to the possibility of trying in the Congo. Let us not have a double standard where we act with great rhetoric and words of “never again” in so many places in the world, but when it comes to Africa, we seem to be unable to act.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 2521, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2521) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the military construction appropriations bill and report for fiscal year 2001. This bill reflects the bipartisan approach that the ranking member, Senator MURRAY of Washington, and I have tried to maintain regarding military construction on this subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator MURRAY and her staff. They have been very cooperative throughout this

whole process. That is very important because we take our jobs here very seriously and this appropriations bill very seriously.

This bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee on May 9. The bill recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is for \$8,634,000,000. The bill is \$600 million over the budget request and approximately \$292 million over last year's enacted level. However, there are some considerations we must make. More importantly, the legislation reflects a reduction of \$1.2 billion from just 4 years ago—a decrease of almost 12 percent.

We sought to recommend to the Senate a balanced bill, and we believe it addresses the key military construction requirements for readiness, for family housing, barracks, quality of life, and the Guard and Reserve components.

As my colleagues well know, we take into strong consideration the Guard and Reserve components because we have seen a shift in our force structure. Our force structure has shifted from Regular Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines to Reserve and Guard components. When we started to do that, we found that around this country our infrastructure was lacking for training of these personnel.

This bill honors a commitment we have to our armed forces. It helps ensure that housing and infrastructure needs of the military are given proper recognition.

Also, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the bill is within the committee's 302(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

This bill has some points I want to mention. It includes \$3.5 billion to provide better and more modern family housing for our service personnel and their families.

On another quality-of-life measure, we have added substantially to the budget request for barracks construction projects. The bill provides \$712 million for 43 projects throughout the United States and overseas. This funding will provide single service members a more favorable living environment wherever they are stationed.

The committee also provides \$101 million for 14 environmental compliance projects.

We also address the shortfalls that continue to plague our Reserve components.

As our active force grows smaller, we are more dependent than ever on our Guard and Reserve for the maintenance of our national security. I continue to be greatly alarmed that the Department of Defense takes no responsibility for ensuring that our Reserve components have adequate facilities.

For the members of the Guard and Reserve, quality of life, too, is very important. It is all about buildings and it is all about facilities from which they work and perform their mission.

Their lack of regard for the total force concept very much concerns me

and many of my colleagues. In Montana, we have the greatest example of a unified Red Horse Division at Malmstrom Air Force Base. It is made up of Regular Air Force and Reserves and is working very well.

This comes at a time when our country is so heavily dependent on the Guard and Reserve to maintain our presence around the world. For example, the President's budget request was for only \$222 million for all of the Reserve components and the National Guard. That was just not enough.

Recognizing this chronic shortfall, we have again lent support by adding \$359 million to these accounts.

In each case, the funds will help satisfy the essential mission; quality of life, and, of course, our readiness requirements.

We fully fund the budget request for the base realignment and closure account by funding \$1.17 billion to continue the ongoing BRAC process and consummate the remaining closures and realignments.

As you know, in this line particularly, it has been very troubling to this committee that environmental cleanup has really soaked up a lot of our funding that should have been used for quality of life.

We will work very closely with the Senate Armed Services Committee as we put together a conference package for military construction.

This bill also includes year 2000 supplemental funding for the Department of Defense in peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and other requirements.

The chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, will speak to these issues as we move along.

I urge the Members of the Senate to support this bill and to move it forward as quickly and as expeditiously as we possibly can.

Now I yield to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor today to offer the fiscal year 2001 military construction appropriations bill. I thank Senator BURNS, the chairman of our committee, and his staff, for being so good in a great bipartisan manner, in being able to work this bill through again this year. I publicly thank him for his work with me in a really solid manner. I appreciate the way he has done that.

Before I address this bill, I want to address some comments that were made about me on this floor by the majority leader just a short time ago.

While I was taking part in a hearing of the Senate Commerce Committee as part of my work to improve pipeline safety in this country, I understand the majority leader suggested that my schedule was a reason why a debate on commonsense gun control was not going to take place today.

Given the work that I have done over the years to protect young people from

gun violence, and my strong support of this weekend's Million Mom March, I was rather surprised by that suggestion. I assure my colleagues that this debate is too important to be delayed any longer.

While I support the majority leader's concern about a family obligation I have; namely, my son is going to be married, there is no excuse for not debating this legislation—especially the absence of any one Member.

If this had been a concern of the majority leader, perhaps he could have spoken to me personally before incorrectly citing me as the reason why the Senate would not be debating gun violence today.

I would like to remind the majority leader that, on November 4, I came to the floor, in the wake of a fatal shooting in my home State, and urged the Members of the Senate to work with me on commonsense solutions to gun violence. Since that time, it has been the congressional majority that has prevented this much needed debate from taking place, and it is the congressional majority today that, again, refuses to address this vital issue.

I would like to remind my colleagues that, on average, 12 children die every day from gunfire. We cannot wait any longer.

Mr. President, I will now turn to the issue before us.

I again am pleased to be here with my chairman, Senator BURNS, in recommending the fiscal year 2001 military construction appropriations bill to the Senate for its approval.

This is an unusual bill this year because it contains emergency supplemental funding for a number of defense items not related to military construction, including U.S. participation in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation and in the Colombia counternarcotics initiative.

I will defer to my ranking member on the full committee, Senator BYRD, and others, to address the items in the supplemental portion of this bill, and I will confine my remarks to the military construction portion of the bill.

This bill provides a total of \$8.634 billion in new spending authority for military construction for fiscal year 2001.

This level of funding exceeds the President's budget request for military construction by \$600 million, and provides nearly \$300 million above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

Nevertheless, as usual, this bill comes up short of what the services need to meet their infrastructure requirements.

At the risk of sounding like a broken record, I once again urge the administration to increase the budget for military construction.

This is a bricks-and-mortar bill.

There is nothing glamorous or "gee-whiz" about aircraft hangars or barracks or armories.

But this is an essential bill, and the projects that it funds are vital to our men and women in uniform.

As many of my colleagues have pointed out to me in the course of developing this bill, the President's budget barely scratches the surface or infrastructure needs.

The requests that Senator BURNS and I have received this year address compelling needs throughout the services, and I wish that we had the resources to fund more of them.

Senator BURNS and his staff deserve a great deal of credit for their dedicated and thoughtful approach in drafting this bill.

As always, they have worked very hard to produce a balanced, bipartisan product that takes into account both the concerns of the Senate and the needs of the military.

In particular, they have done a superb job of continuing to shine the spotlight on the quality of life projects that are so important to our men and women in uniform, and to their families.

At a time when military enlistment and retention are declining—and the services are unable to match the financial incentives of the private sector—quality of life issues are amplified in importance.

Quality of life issues do not diminish the importance of readiness projects, but we must not dismiss their role in recruiting and retaining our military personnel.

Within the budget constraints that we are all forced to operate this year, this bill attempts to meet the most urgent and timely military construction needs with very limited resources.

All of the major construction projects that we have funded have been authorized.

In addition, we have ensured adequate funding for family housing and barracks construction.

However, I remain concerned that the nation's overall investment in military infrastructure continues to lag, and I hope we will see a more robust effort in future budgets.

This is an extremely important bill for our nation and our military forces.

I again commend Senator BURNS, and I thank the staff of the Appropriations Committee, including Sid Ashworth, Christina Evans, and Sonia King, as well as Mark Borreson, a fellow on my staff, for their excellent work in producing the bill.

Mr. President, I look forward to completing action on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go

into a period of morning business for the Senator from New Jersey to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 30 minutes.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am going to continue discussing the issue we were talking about earlier. In my earlier remarks, while talking about trade, we talked about the value of trade with the sub-Saharan nations, whose economic subjugation created all kinds of problems. We talked about the economic strangulation that presents so many problems and creates violence and corruption and lawlessness in some of these countries. We are hoping that this trade can suppress those differences and that violence.

I was making the point that we in this country have a problem of our own regarding gun violence, which is very detrimental to the harmonious functioning within our society. We have these huge differences between those who think that "guns unlimited" ought to be the rule. I had the opportunity to hear a brilliant author, Gary Wills, talk about why it is that people distrust Government. One of the issues he brings up—and I am paraphrasing some here—is that when people see that violence pervades our society, we have to have some sense of a regulation. He pointed out that if we didn't have regulations on our highways, highway safety programs, our system would be rendered useless because people would be afraid to go out on the highways because of the mayhem it would create.

I think it is a fairly simple thing to understand that if you were able to drive as fast as you wanted on either side of the road, we would be killing and maiming one another. I don't understand why it is that we can't have some sensible gun violence control in this country, some regulation. Why is this one part of our society so exempt from any kind of sensible regulation that says a person who wants to buy a gun ought to be qualified physically and emotionally to do so, and that if they want to buy a gun they ought not have any history of violent behavior?

I wrote legislation regarding spousal abuse. I said anybody convicted of a misdemeanor for spousal abuse ought not to be able to own a gun. I had terrific resistance in this place. I could not get it through, really. Finally, we got it through as a piece of legislation on a budget.

What has happened in 3½ years? Well, 33,000 people who are not qualified by virtue of violence against a spouse or their children—domestic abusers—have been prevented from getting guns, where maybe they pointed a gun at somebody and said, "If you don't listen to me, I will blow your brains out." I think it was a positive measure.

The Brady bill was fought tooth and nail before it was passed. The Brady bill gave Government time to check out these individuals who are applying for guns or gun ownership at such a prolific rate that we ought to have some measure of control. Well, after a long debate and a lot of suffering, had Jim Brady, who was shot while an attempt was made on the life of President Reagan, not wheeled himself around the Capitol, it never would have passed.

What was the effect of the Brady bill—the thing the gun lobby was so afraid of that would "impair freedom"? Baloney, as we say. Well, 500,000 people were prevented from getting guns, thank the Lord. What would have happened? Those 500,000 people who were not qualified either by virtue of personal characteristics, background, a tendency toward violence, or trouble, could have gotten guns. Thank goodness they were not able to get guns.

We wonder whether or not, with a Million Moms March imminent on Mother's Day, anybody thinks mothers are clamoring to leave their homes and march in protest because they have nothing better to do on Mother's Day. That is the most revered holiday, next to Christmas, that we have in our society. It is when people flock to see moms. I know my children want to see their mother. My grandchildren want to see their mother. A lot of them in my family will be out there marching because they are sick and tired of worrying about whether or not their children, when they go to school to learn, to sing, to play, to make friends, are going to get shot, are going to get assaulted, are going to get killed or wounded in such a way that they never recover. That doesn't only mean those who were hit with a bullet. It means friends who saw their classmates at Columbine lying down and trying to crawl out windows to get away from the madness, in fear for their lives.

What was the impact of that throughout the school? Did the wounding stop with those hit with a bullet? Or do those wounds go on forever? Some lost friends who were 16 and 17 years old—kids in the prime of life. Those wounds will last forever. So it is not only those who are involved in the fracas; it is everybody—all of us across the country.

Look at the physical cost: metal detectors, guards, cameras, rigid processes for transportation. It costs a fortune. Frankly, I think we should just put a lid on this proliferation of guns and stop the unlicensed gun dealers from selling guns and not asking any questions of the buyer—"buyers anonymous"—at gun shows across the country. If you want to buy guns, just put your money down, brother, and you can have all the guns you want and walk away. You could be one of the 10 most wanted criminals in the United States on the FBI's Ten Most Wanted list. Even if they recognize you, they have no obligation in the States that don't

have control because the Federal Government doesn't have it all; they are under no obligation to say, hey, we know you are sought after. We know you are a criminal.

There are no rules. We ought to stop that and we ought to make a pledge to the mothers who are going to be out there on Sunday that we are going to do something about it, instead of sitting on our hands over a year since Columbine. It is almost a year now since we passed the gun show loophole closure in this body and sent it over to the House as part of a conference. That is what we do here. The House and the Senate confer and they try to agree on a bill. They don't want to act on it. The action is no action. That inaction is the rule because they don't want to bring up the gun issue. It is too sensitive. It might be too offensive to the NRA. It might be too offensive to the gun lobby. We are saying, no, we have to do something about it. The least thing we are going to do today is offer a resolution and, we hope, get it passed.

We ask those on the other side who won't join us to stand up in front of the American public and say: I don't think you are entitled to send your child to a safe school; you have to run the risk. After all, guns are more important than my kids or my grandchildren. I can tell you that the so-called "freedom to own a gun and maim people," and the Constitution says you are allowed to shoot at anybody you want to, is not a matter—in the wildest imagination—of the second amendment.

Mr. President we have a limit of time. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator has 20 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I want to give as much time as my colleague from New York needs, not more than 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding. I thank him for not only his generosity in yielding time but for his leadership this year and last year on this issue, and in the 18 years he has been in the Senate. We will really miss him in many ways as he goes on to other things, but one of the most important reasons we will miss him is as the leader in this fight to bring sensibility and rationality to gun laws.

I hope we will pass the resolution the Senator from New Jersey is offering and that it will not be blocked. I hope people will let us vote because we are voting in the shadow of a momentous movement that is taking place in America.

I have been fighting in the Congress for gun control for 20 years. I have seen the various ebbs and flows in public opinion on guns. I have seen modest gun control measures, such as this one, bottled up in committee and picked to death by those who do the NRA's bidding. I was on the front lines when we

scratched and clawed our way through a few victories such as Brady and the assault weapons ban.

We are on this floor now because the world changes on Mother's Day. On Mother's Day, the political landscape will undergo a seismic shock. There is a classic sign in the movie "Network" where a TV commentator shouts, "I am mad as hell, and I'm not going to take it anymore." And that leads to a spontaneous reaction where families heave their TV set out the window.

That is what the Million Mom March is. It is a spontaneous assemblage of ordinary citizens who are not going to take it anymore. It is bigger, more passionate, and more widespread than any movement we have seen in years. It is a movement more powerful and more numerous than any of us could ever have hoped.

When the mothers of this Nation gather on Constitution Avenue, their collective footsteps will sound like a shot heard around the world. They are not going to put up with lame excuses from Congress about why the Lautenberg amendment is bottled up. They are not going to put up with any more reasons about why we can't pass the most basic, commonsense gun measures.

Let me say to George Bush, and anyone else who is standing in the way of closing the gun show loophole, that our mothers are watching. On Mother's Day, the mothers of this Nation will give us the gift of common sense. There is a new force in the country today and its name is Mom. Today we are simply giving this body a chance to not make Mom too angry.

I thank the Senator and yield any time I have not used to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, we are in morning business, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining in morning business.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to make a unanimous consent request. In fairness, I want to see a Republican on the floor before we make that request about time. So if the staff would arrange to have someone come to the floor, I would appreciate it because I want to continue talking about this resolution we have already sent up to the desk.

We are looking for very simple, commonsense changes. I can't imagine anybody saying we should not prohibit juveniles from possessing assault weapons. It is hard to oppose that. Does anyone seriously believe juveniles need assault weapons? Additionally, we should require child safety locks to be sold with handguns. It is a simple step we can take to try to protect kids who get a hold of guns. We know that the 6-year-old who used a gun to murder another 6-year-old would not have been

able to do so, A, if the gun had been properly protected from reach by a child; or, B, if the gun had had a safety lock, the child wouldn't have been able to operate it.

We also ought to study—I know the Senator from California wants to talk about this—the marketing of guns to juveniles. She spoke about it a few moments ago. I heard her talk about it. It was so clear and so precise that it is hard to argue against it.

Why shouldn't we examine what it is we are doing to convince little kids that their mark of maturity is going to be to own a gun? I don't understand why.

When it comes to guns, we are talking about deadly weapons. We are not talking about play toys that might turn over or something such as that. This is automatically associated with killing, with death, with injury—a gun in the wrong hands.

No, we are not saying that every gun owner is out for murder. We are not saying every gun owner is out to hurt people, but there are enough people that it makes an enormous difference whether or not guns are out there in the hands of the wrong people. We ought to make sure they are not being sold as toys.

These are all commonsense measures. They passed this Senate as part of a juvenile justice bill just about a year ago next week. It was sent over to the House. We got our conference committee together.

How much time do I have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to yield 10 minutes to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from New Jersey. Let me echo what he has said on the floor in this matter—that we want to protect our children and our families from gun violence. He will be sorely missed.

I want to pick up on something that was said about the million moms. I think Senator LAUTENBERG, as a grandfather, has spoken most eloquently as to what the women of this country really want.

It is hard to generalize about it to people, but I can truly say, if there is anyone in our society who is more selfless than any other, it happens to be moms. When you love someone more than you love yourself, that is what happens. The fact that they are coming here in such amazing numbers is truly remarkable. I think when everyone across the Nation who is coming here on this issue is added up, it will be a million moms.

There is a web page for the Million Mom March. It is called the Tapestry, and moms are calling that site; they are writing their stories.

One woman from El Cerrito writes:

Ten years ago, my beautiful son, Andrew, killed himself with a bullet to his brain. He

was mentally ill, and never should have been able to buy a gun. I will be at the March with one of my daughters, who is also a mother, because something has got to bring Congress to its senses.

Then there are several others. One wrote the following:

Once I wrote a letter to my Congressman asking him to support sensible gun laws. He sent me back a three-page letter upholding the second amendment, but this had no effect on me as in my life I have lost my father and uncle and a nephew by marriage to guns. One was murder, one was a suicide, and one was accidental. Had guns not been around and easy to get, none of these untimely and sad deaths would have occurred.

We are at a time in our history when we can look back at what is happening to our people. When I was a young mom—now I am a grandmom—the reason I got involved in politics was that I thought the Vietnam war was wrong. I marched with my children in California at that time to say enough is enough; let's end the killing.

We lost 58,168 of our valued sons and daughters in that war. For that period of 11 years, let's look at the statistics we have in our Nation from a different kind of war, a war in our streets, in our suburbs, in our schools, in our counties, our cities, in churches and child care centers: 395,441 dead. If the moms of America marched to end the war in Vietnam where 58,168 died—and they did help end it—we can turn around this tragic number and win this war in our streets.

I say straight from my heart, we will not win this war unless people in this body have the guts and the courage to stand up to the gun lobby. We will not win this war if people in this body and in the House of Representatives do not have the heart and the guts and the courage to stand up to the gun lobby and its power. I pray that we will have that courage and we will have the strength to do it and turn around what is happening.

Senator LAUTENBERG has talked about the juvenile justice bill. It is stuck in limbo, twisting in the wind in the conference committee after we had five sensible gun laws attached to it. They are very sensible and include: closing the gun show loophole so that people who shouldn't have a gun cannot get a gun at a gun show; banning the importation of high-capacity ammunition clips for automatic weapons, Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment; requiring child safety devices be sold with every hand gun, Senator KOHL; an amendment by Senator ASHCROFT that says it is illegal to sell or give a semi-automatic to anyone under the age of 18; and the fifth, requiring the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General to study the extent to which the gun industry markets to juveniles.

If we thought Joe Camel was bad—and we know Joe Camel was bad—let's look at what the National Rifle Association is doing to market to our children. This is the beautiful, quite lovely NRA logo with the eagle. This is their logo. Here we see the cartoon version

of that eagle, "Eddie the Eagle." This is the gun lobby kids' cartoon. This is the eagle of the NRA. These kids are not 18. They are nowhere near 18. They are babies.

What makes us think the gun lobby wants to market to kids? Let's take a look at what they say in an ad from a firearm manufacturer: "Building the next generation of customers takes work and commitment. But it must be done." "Our greatest threat is the lack of a future customer base." "We continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . . ."

There shouldn't be any question about it. Just as Joe Camel was aimed at kids, so is Eddie the Eagle aimed at kids.

Here is Joe Camel, the cartoon version of the camel advertisement. Here is the gun lobby kids' cartoon. It is hard to do this all in 10 minutes, but that is all my colleagues on the other side would let me have. Here are Eddie Eagle products for kids: Eddie Eagle lunch box, Eddie Eagle Jitter Critter, 3D glasses, tattoo pac, Eddie E. B-Nee baby.

That is not marketing to grownups, my friends; it is marketing to kids. The gun lobby doesn't want us to look at it, but we will.

When they had the tobacco lawsuits, we were able to find out what the tobacco company said in secret memos: "If our company is to survive and prosper . . . we must get our share of the youth market." "Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential regular customer."

Sound familiar to the gun lobby?

Look at what they say: "The greatest threat we face is the lack of a future customer base. . . ." "We continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . . ."

Cigarette companies, Joe Camel, firearms company, Eddie the Eagle.

I don't have any objection in terms of a family learning to hunt, but tell me what is right about teaching a 4-year-old child how to load a handgun. Yet this ad is proudly displayed in gun magazines. This child is 4 years old.

This sums it all up. How is this for an ad in *Gun World*: "Start 'em Young! There is no time like the present."

This is a very young boy, maybe 15, holding a toy gun, that looks like a real gun, shooting at a can of soda. It is a little bit of a love letter from him about shooting. "Start 'em Young!"

In the juvenile justice bill, I was fortunate enough to get through this Senate, by a unanimous vote, a study of the gun dealers marketing to children. Guess what. ED MARKEY took that on the House side and got the same thing passed. So we have identical amendments in the House and Senate. Out of all of the gun amendments we passed, this is the only one that had identical language in the House and Senate. What does that mean? It means we could make this the law of the land tomorrow if there were good faith in this Republican Congress. We can in good

faith take my amendment that passed here by unanimous vote, and passed over in the House unanimously, and start this study right now.

But no. To all who say politics doesn't matter, let me state what this wasted time means. It means that every day they are starting them young. It means that every day, a child might pick up a gun because it so much fun—they see it in the ads. And they can pick up a gun and accidentally injure themselves or someone else.

It is an unbelievable situation that a year after we passed five sensible gun measures, we have done nothing.

Let me close with something from the Million Mom March from Janet Lazar of Menlo Park, CA. Listen to this.

As a social worker for children and families, I have heard the voices of many children who have become victims of violence. Listen to the still voice of a child describing her mother held at gunpoint by her father. Listen to the cold, dead voice of a beautiful 15-year-old girl describe the six friends and relatives she lost to gang warfare. Listen to her bewilderment as she wonders if she will live to raise children of her own. Listen to the suicidal voice of the young man who accidentally killed his best friend as they fooled around with an unlocked handgun.

She writes:

My heart cries for someone to listen to the children. The time to act is now.

To the creator of the Million Mom March, who is a constituent of Senator LAUTENBERG—and how appropriate that is—I say thank you. I say thank you for caring about the children. I say thank you for giving up your Mother's Day and coming here. I say thank you for taking a risk that maybe your idea would not catch on. I say thank you for doing what we Americans do best, acting—acting on facts, acting on information, and, yes, acting on anger.

It is an honor to be on the floor today with my friend, Senator LAUTENBERG. It is an honor to stand by his side as we, together, fight to make sure the laws of this land reflect the priorities of the people and the mothers and the children and the families.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from California for her ever persistent fight to protect children and protect the families in this country. We are going to continue, no matter what turn of events we see. We want the public to be heard.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have a resolution that simply commends the participants of the Million Mom March this weekend for rallying for their communities to demand sensible gun safety legislation. It calls on Congress to complete action on the juvenile justice bill before the Memorial Day recess.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 305, which was introduced by me, that the resolution and

the preamble be agreed to en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I object, as a Member of the Senate from the State of Colorado.

Objection is heard.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen who can hear me, what an irony it is. What an irony it is. The Senator from Colorado objects to simple gun safety legislation. What an irony it is that this place is empty, but the voice of negativism creeps through.

I want all the million moms across the country to hear this. They are saying: No, no to sensible gun safety legislation. They are saying: No, Mom, your kids are going to go to school and it is too bad, it is too bad if some little maniac, or some confused child has a gun in his or her hand. Too bad, too bad, unless it is their kid, God forbid.

What are we witnessing here? Foolishness. The public ought to know it. They ought to stand up and shout: We are not going to take it anymore. A million mothers marching across this country—I hope they are made furious by this objection.

Object to a resolution? A resolution, for my friends who do not know, is not a law. It is simply a thought. It is the way we think we ought to do things. We are far from legislation. We just think we ought to protect children. We think we ought to make it tougher for people to have guns randomly. We think we ought to make it tougher for young children to learn that guns are a step toward manhood. They ought to learn. They ought to learn.

Remember the image—the kids at Columbine, the bleeding boy reaching out the window for help: Somebody, help me before I get killed. Or the little children at the school in California—little kids, like my grandchildren, like your grandchild, being led by policemen so they could get away from a gunman. Or the youngsters saying a prayer in Waco, TX, heads bent in prayer, and some idiot comes by and starts shooting. Or that 6-year-old child killing another 6-year-old child.

So we cannot enact a law that says you have to put your gun away if you have one, so a child can't get ahold of it? Or make it childproof?

The Republicans say: No. We have 51-50 vote when the Vice President cast a tie vote and it went to the House. The House didn't want to cooperate, the Republican majority there said: No, no, let's bury this thing.

Bury it. What a terrible term. What a terrible term. Because we are talking about funerals and burials, instead of laughter, instead of love, instead of friendship. It is a black day, a bad day for America. I hope the million moms, when they get together, will talk about this.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Was it part of my friend's resolution, welcoming the million moms to Washington?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It was a resolution to welcome them.

Mrs. BOXER. Let's be clear here about what is being objected to. This is a resolution that says to the million moms: Thank you for caring about our children; thank you for being good mothers; Thank you for giving up Mother's Day to be here, to stand for a cause that is bigger than each of us separately.

It is hard for me to believe the Republicans would object to welcoming the million moms to this town, moms who are Democrats, Republicans, those declining to state—maybe they don't have a party. This is not a partisan issue.

I say to my friend, thank you for bringing this to the floor. I think the American people are finally going to see who stands up for what is right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the floor, not in exhaustion, not in fatigue, but ours to fight another day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend our colleague, Senator LAUTENBERG, for his efforts. He has done the Senate a service and has called the Senate and the Nation's attention to the importance of the Million Mom March. I appreciate as well the participation and the leadership Senator BOXER is always able to provide for our caucus on so many issues before the Senate. They have articulated very ably and admirably for our caucus today in expressing to all of those coming from all parts of the country how important it is they express themselves, how important it is they exercise their constitutional opportunities in this great country, how important it is they send a message to the rest of the country, as well as to Members of the Congress, the critical nature of the need to address the gun issue in an effective way.

That is all they are coming to express themselves on, and it is appropriate at this time, and given the tremendous message that numbers of women will send by their presence, that we acknowledge their presence and welcome them to this city; that we tell them we are listening; that we resolve to respond in as effective a way as we can.

Again, I thank the senior Senator from New Jersey for his efforts, and the Senator from California for participating, for sending that message loudly and clearly and for doing all they can to recognize the importance of what will happen in Washington on Sunday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, did the Senator wish to respond?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Can I have 1 minute?

Mr. WARNER. Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his always courteous response to a request.

It was disheartening to see we could not get a resolution adopted—not law, a thought, an idea, what we would like to do, that says we welcome the committed women who are involved in the march who are going to gather in places across this country to protest the threat of violence to their children.

I thank our leader, and my colleague from California, for being such active supporters of this protest against violence. I am sorry we did not have a chance to get a vote on it. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his friendly remarks as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this weekend, hundreds of thousands of mothers and "honorary mothers" will convene in Washington, DC and communities around the country to call for sensible gun legislation for safe kids.

On Sunday, Americans will unite for the Million Mom March, the first-ever national march for gun-safety. The mothers from Michigan and around the country come from all walks of life. They live in cities, in suburbs and in rural America. They are of all races, all religions and all political persuasions. They are our friends and neighbors, our community leaders.

On Mothers' Day, 2000, these "mothers and others" will join together to grieve over the loss of their loved ones, and the loss of more than 4,000 young people who are killed by gunfire each year.

Among these mothers will be Veronica McQueen, the Michigan mother who lost her six year old daughter, Kayla Rolland, to gun violence earlier this year. Ms. McQueen said, "I just don't want to see another parent have to bury another baby over this, over something that is preventable, something that is very, very preventable."

Gun violence is preventable. But mothers can not act alone. Mothers in the Million Mom March know: In order to reduce the level of gun violence in their homes and communities, Congress must pass legislation to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals.

Some of us in this Congress have heard the cry of families around this country and worked to pass sensible legislation to protect our nation's children. That legislation would limit access to guns by prohibited persons by, among other things, closing the gun show loophole—applying background checks to guns sold at gun shows.

The Lautenberg-Kerrey gun show amendment that passed in the Senate,

but not in the House of Representatives, is one of the most important provisions we can pass this Congress. It will close the loophole that allows criminals and other prohibited persons to buy guns at gun shows that they would not otherwise be permitted to purchase.

It a loophole that is often exploited by those who do not want to undergo background checks—including Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, the Columbine killers. Harris and Klebold used four semiautomatic assault weapons in their now infamous attack on their classmates. Of the four guns, three were purchased by Robyn Anderson at a gun show in Adams County, Colorado.

Robyn, who was 18 at the time, bought three semiautomatic assault weapons for her younger friends. She later testified before the Colorado Legislature about her purchase and the need to close the gun show loophole. She said: "Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gone to the Tanner gun show on Saturday and they took me back with them on Sunday. . . While we were walking around, Eric and Dylan kept asking sellers if they were private or licensed. They wanted to buy their guns from someone who was private—and not licensed—because there would be no paperwork or background check."

Robyn continues: "I was not asked any questions at all. There was no background check. All I had to do was show my driver's license to prove that I was 18. Dylan got a shotgun. Eric got a shotgun and a black rifle that he bought clips for. He was able to buy clips and ammunition without me having to show any I.D. The sellers didn't write down any information."

"I would not have bought a gun for Eric and Dylan if I had had to give any personal information or submit any kind of check at all. I think it was clear to the sellers that the guns were for Eric and Dylan. They were the ones asking all the questions and handling all the guns."

Robyn concluded: "I wish a law requiring background checks had been in effect at the time. I don't know if Eric and Dylan would have been able to get guns from another source, but I would not have helped them. It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check."

The Columbine killers took advantage of the gun show loophole and the result was deadly. Congress has the chance to close this loophole with the Lautenberg amendment. That amendment requires prospective purchasers to undergo background checks at gun shows and gives law enforcement up to three business days to those checks if there is any potentially disqualifying information—as set forth in the current Brady law.

Honest, law-abiding Americans are not affected by these background

checks. 72 percent of the checks are completed within three minutes, and 95 percent are cleared within two hours. FBI records reveal that the five percent of people whose background checks take more than 24 hours to complete, are 20 times more likely to have a criminal record or otherwise be prohibited from accessing weapons.

Congress must pass legislation that gives law enforcement up to three business days, when needed, to complete background checks at gun shows, and truly close the gun show loophole. As of this day, Congress has failed to do so, and has subsequently failed the families of the Columbine victims and others who have lost loved ones to gunfire.

On this Sunday, I will march with the families of those victims from Michigan and around the country, who are calling on Congress to end their agony. In the words of one mother, it's time to turn tears into action. Congress must pass "sensible gun laws for safe kids." Let's start by closing the gun show loophole today. It's time to end the plague of gun violence on America's children.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in welcoming the Million Mom March to Washington this weekend. Their campaign for sensible gun control has captured the attention of the nation, and it deserves to capture the attention of Congress too. Their message is irresistible. Gun crimes and gun violence are a serious challenge to the nation, and it is wrong for the United States Senate to bury its head in the sand on this fundamental issue. More than a year has passed since the Columbine tragedy, and we have failed to finish the job we began last year on the Juvenile Justice Bill. Democrats have repeatedly asked for the House and Senate conferees to meet and approve a final bill that includes the Senate-passed gun control provisions. We wait and wait and wait, while schools and children across the country continue to suffer from the epidemic of gun violence that plagues so many of our communities.

Too many children are in continuing danger of gun violence in their homes and schools and neighborhoods. These are not new problems, but they have become increasingly serious, and it is irresponsible for Congress to look the other way and ignore them.

Our goal is to support parents, youths, educators, law enforcement authorities, and communities. We have a shared responsibility to find solutions to these problems. Fifty million school children are waiting for our answer.

The greatest tragedy of the school shootings across the nation is they have not shocked us into doing everything we can to prevent them in the future. By refusing to learn from these tragedies, Congress is condemning the country to repeat them. How many wake-up calls will it take before Congress finally responds?

Current statistics on children and guns are unacceptable.

For every child killed with a gun, four others are wounded. According to the Centers for Disease Control, the rate of firearm deaths of children 0-14 years old is twelve times higher in the United States than in 25 other industrial nations combined.

Over 6,000 students were expelled in 1996-97 for bringing guns to school. The Journal of the American Medical Association reports that between 36% and 50% of male eleventh graders believe they could easily get a gun if they wanted one.

In a 1997 survey, 9% of high school students had carried a weapon to school during the 30 days preceding the survey; 6% had a gun.

Between July 1, 1994 and June 30, 1998, there were 173 violent deaths in schools.

In a recent survey of over 100,000 teenagers conducted last month, 30% said they could get a gun in a few hours and 11% more said they could get a gun in one day.

1 in 5 of these teenagers have felt afraid at school since the Columbine High School shootings a year ago.

4 in 10 of these same teenagers said there are guns in their homes, and more than half of them say they have access to those weapons.

In 1996, more than 1300 children aged 10-19 committed suicide with firearms. Unlike suicide attempts using other methods, suicide attempts with gun are nearly always fatal, which means that a temporarily depressed teenager will never get a second chance at life. Two-thirds of all completed teenage suicides involve a firearm.

The firearm injury epidemic, due largely to handgun injuries, is ten times larger than the polio epidemic of the first half of this century.

The nation's gun laws are a disgrace. We need to close the gun show loophole, support child safety locks on guns, and provide greater resources for strict enforcement of the gun laws now on the books.

The guns used to kill nine of the 13 people murdered at Columbine High School were purchased at a gun show. The woman who bought the guns for Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold said that she would never have purchased those guns if she had to submit her name for a background check.

More than 800 Americans, young and old, die each year from guns fired by children under the age of 19. It shouldn't take a Columbine, a Jonesboro, or an urban drive-by shooting to persuade us to act.

Perhaps six-year-old Kayla Rolland would be alive today if the gun that her classmate used had a child safety lock on it.

Perhaps a 13-year-old school girl in Deming, New Mexico and a school vice-principal in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania would still be alive if the young shooters did not have access to the guns.

American children are more at risk from firearms than the children of any

other industrial nation. In a recent year, firearms killed no children in Japan, 19 children in Great Britain, 57 children in Germany, 109 children in France, 153 children in Canada—and 5,285 children in the United States.

Shame on the National Rifle Association, shame on the Republican Party, and shame on the United States Congress for tolerating figures like that. My fervent hope is that the Million Mom March will succeed where so many other efforts in recent years have failed, and that Congress at long last will be persuaded to act. The irresistible force of the Million Mom March is about to meet the immovable object of Congress—and I intend to do all I can to see that the immovable object of Congress finally moves.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud today to recognize and welcome the visit to Washington, DC by a group of my fellow West Virginians for this Sunday's "Million Mom March."

The Million Mom March, coinciding with Mothers' Day, is a grassroots effort led by people across the country—Dads and Kids included—dedicated to educating our children and our nation about guns; both the dangers posed by their misuse and the tragic toll this misuse has taken on our country's youth, their friends, and their families. The people who attend this event here in Washington will have gathered in the parking lots of schools, churches, and synagogues across the country, and will have come here to let those of us in Congress know, in no uncertain terms, that we need to be doing more to protect our children.

I am pleased to say that among those relaying that message this weekend will be a delegation of Moms from West Virginia, many with their entire families in tow. As they point out, one difference many of these West Virginian Moms may have from others participating in this weekend's events is that they also have hunters in their own families. In fact, it would not surprise me at all to find out that more than a few of the folks marching were hunters themselves.

In West Virginia, we respect the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms, and we consider parents and children hunting together to be a time-honored tradition. Yet our state legislature has already taken the responsible step of limiting possession and legal ownership of handguns to those 18 and older. Now the West Virginian Moms join with their counterparts from around the nation to demand that Members of Congress respond appropriately to the epidemic of American children killed and injured by accidents and crime involving guns.

Unfortunately, all too often when we in Congress discuss the misuse of guns, the debate turns into a pointless back-and-forth about whether we have too many gun laws, or too few. Rather than engage in that debate, I would just invite my colleagues to consider these staggering statistics:

One in 910 American children die because of the misuse of guns before the age of 20.

American children under the age of 15 are twelve times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined.

Seventy-seven percent of murder victims aged 13–17 are killed by a firearm.

Last year:

4,205 children and teens were killed by gunfire;

2,562 were murdered by gunfire;

1,262 committed suicide using a firearm; and

306 died from an accidental shooting.

Each day:

Two children under the age of 5 are murdered;

Six children and youths under 20 commit suicide;

Ten children and youths under 20 are homicide victims; and

Twelve children and youth under 20 die from firearm misuse.

Between 1979 and 1997, gunfire killed nearly 80,000 children and teens in America—25,000 more than the total number of American soldiers killed in battle in Vietnam.

Firearms wounded an additional 320,000 children during this same period.

In that period, more than 25,000 children took their own lives with firearms, and nearly 10,000 died as a result of an accidental shooting.

In 1997, my home state of West Virginia lost 23 children younger than 20 to firearm misuse, up seven from the previous year. Nine were murdered, ten committed suicide, and three were the victims of accidents.

Mr. President, last year the United States Senate passed the Juvenile Justice bill. Among its provisions, this bill contained some courageous efforts to address the culture of crime and violence in which our children are being raised. The bill also featured some common-sense measures designed to make guns safer, and provisions to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. The Senate also sought to close the so-called gun show loophole. Sadly, our seeming inability to have any discussion about guns has kept the conferees on this bill from reporting back to the respective houses with a version for final passage.

My purpose here today is to join the Million Moms in calling attention to the bottom line. We live in a society in which the lives of children are tragically at risk because of the virtually unfettered availability of guns. Our respect for the constitutional rights of gun owners should never overwhelm the love and caring we have for our children. I commend the Moms, from West Virginia and around the country, who come to remind us what our priorities should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I make a parliamentary inquiry. Are we now out of morning business and on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the military construction bill.

Mr. WARNER. Fine.

Mr. President, in the course of the deliberations before the Senate Appropriations Committee on this measure, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD—former majority leader of the Senate; one who has served in the Senate 41 years—brought before that committee an amendment entitled the Byrd-Warner amendment dealing with the issue of the balance of power in the Constitution between the executive branch, the President, and the legislative branch, the Congress of the United States, as it relates to matters of foreign policy but, most particularly, as it relates to the matter—and perhaps the most important entrusted to both the President of the United States and the Congress—the most important matter of when the President, as Commander in Chief, sends beyond the shores of our great Nation men and women in uniform into harm's way in the cause of peace.

This week, those of us on the Republican side of the aisle had our weekly luncheon, as did our good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. At our luncheon, Senator STROM THURMOND stood and asked if we could observe a moment of silence as he recounted the closing day of World War II, when hostilities ceased in Europe—the bloodiest of all wars, in which 292,000 men and women, wearing the uniform of the Armed Services of the United States, lost their lives.

You could have heard a pin drop in that caucus as that great soldier, as that great statesman, asked for remembrance of the veterans of those generations.

In a very humble way, I have a brief memory. At age 17, I joined the Navy. It was January of 1945. I was simply trained, as were thousands of other youngsters my age, because at that point in January, in the winter of 1945, both the war in Europe and the war in the Pacific were inconclusive. I simply was at training command, waiting for the invasion of Japan. I thank God that last battle in the Pacific never occurred, not only for myself but for millions of others who would have been involved.

I look back very humbly on the modest contribution I made in uniform, both in that war and again during the Korean war, where I served in the Marines for a brief period.

The military did far more for me than I did for the military. Today, that 17-year-old sailor as of 1945 is privileged to be the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, a dream I thought would never be fulfilled.

I again reiterate, my service was modest. On both sides of the aisle, there are men who have served and show the scars of war, who understand the burden on the President of the United States as he sends forth troops into harm's way. I respect these individuals greatly for their knowledge, for having borne the pain in the field of battle, unlike myself. But I was there when others did.

The point of this is the gravity of the decision to send forth our people—the sons and the daughters of people from every village and town across this Nation.

I recount World War II. I then go to Korea, again, where I served as a young Marine officer. Over 50,000 men and women lost their lives in that conflict.

During the course of the Vietnam conflict, I was privileged to serve in the Navy as Undersecretary of the Navy and then as Secretary of the Navy. I was there 5 years, 4 months, and 3 days. Over 50,000 men and women lost their lives, not to mention the number of those wounded.

The point I make is, the last time this Nation declared war was World War II. Yet since that time we have sent men and women into harm's way, beyond our shores, over 100 times.

We never declared war in the Korean conflict. As a matter of fact, it was called the forgotten war. We never declared war in Vietnam, a war that not only brought tremendous casualties on the field of battle and a wrenching experience to the families—as each war does—but it divided this Nation. Indeed, it was the people of this Nation who rose up and, finally, through their elected representatives in Congress, provided the basis for the withdrawal of our troops from that conflict.

That is what this amendment is all about. It is a decision of power between the executive and the legislative branches. It is assuming the responsibility—the responsibility to join with the President or not join with the President—in sending those people beyond our shores. No greater responsibility rests upon a Member of Congress than that.

I have had the privilege to know Presidents. I have had the privilege to learn from my elder statesmen in this Chamber—foremost among them John Stennis, John Tower, Barry Goldwater, and “Scoop” Jackson, all of whom worked on the Armed Services Committee—of how Presidents of our great Nation face up to that decision to go or not to go.

Stennis used to tell the story that Lyndon Johnson told him. The President used to say to Stennis: When that phone rings at night, and there is a troubled spot in the world, and I have to make the decision, Do I or do I not send those troops? I always thought, Where is an aircraft carrier, an island of America? What is the nearest force structure of the U.S. to this conflict?

It is a big decision. Read the biographies of our Presidents. It is a tough

decision. Congress has an obligation to share with the President in the making of that decision. That is my point. That is what this amendment is about.

We have not really fully shared in that decisionmaking since World War II. Yes, we have the power to declare war under the Constitution. We also have the sole power over the purse—the power to decide whether that President can utilize the taxpayers' contribution each year in the operations of the United States.

Just this week, the Armed Services Committee concluded its bill—roughly \$309 billion—to provide for the Armed Forces of the United States. It is the biggest money bill that goes through here. It will be brought to the floor next week, hopefully.

That is what I am talking about—the power of the purse. Our committee authorizes, and the committee under the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the distinguished cosponsor of this amendment, Mr. BYRD, then make the decisions on the appropriations against the authorization. That is what this amendment is about. It is about how we conduct the expenditure in this bill—\$2 billion-plus for Kosovo alone—how we go about spending the taxpayers' money for that. How does it directly relate to the safety and welfare of those brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who are marching through, or patrolling through, or standing watch night and day in Kosovo?

Mr. President, I first went to Kosovo in 1990 with then-leader Bob Dole. There was a group of four or five of us. I remember that trip very well. I remember that we exited rather speedily from Kosovo because there was a riot developing. So many people wanted to see the American Senators, wanted to tell the American Senators about the cruelty and the deprivation of human rights that was then, in 1990, being inflicted on the people of Kosovo—Kosovo being a part of Yugoslavia—being inflicted by Milosevic. Little did we know that war would soon spread through this region—first in Bosnia, and then it would erupt in Kosovo.

Well, we saw those people. We went by the famous field where, hundreds of years ago, the people of that region fought off the barbarian insiders and lost the battle. They still consider that the most hallowed ground in Kosovo. That region has been subjected to fighting and internal strife ever since. Even Hitler put some 21 divisions in there to try to control the Yugoslav region, and finally he told his generals to just contain them as best they could. He never could subvert that province because of the internal fighting. Throughout the occupation of the German armies, a continuous civil war raged among the various religious and ethnic factions in that region. The Germans just sort of turned their back on them. One German general said in a dispatch to Berlin about those who died in this civil war: “Less mouths to feed, less backs to clothe.”

What a desperate, desperate cauldron of humanity. I expect that at one time or another in our deliberations in this body on Bosnia and Kosovo, every Member has availed themselves of the history of this region. As many times as I have been there—I believe I was the first U.S. Senator to go into Sarajevo in September of 1992, at the height of the fighting of the civil war in that town. I remember the French, who were controlling such security as was available, just in an airport where we were trying to bring in Red Cross supplies and food, put me in an armored vehicle and drove me around the town. We looked out through a little slit and firing was going on.

A French colonel and a former Foreign Legionnaire said, “I have fought in battles all over the world, and I cannot understand this one.” The Croats, Bosnians, Serbians were fighting each other. He said, “If you saw them in a room, you could not tell the difference. Most are well-educated people.” He said, “In all my years of combat in far-flung places of the world, I have never seen the violence that these people can inflict on one another. I have never seen anything like it.”

That violence raged for years, until the U.N. and then NATO forces finally came in and stabilized peace in that region. The war in Kosovo, we know well. We did everything we could at the diplomatic table. There were negotiations and valiant efforts by many. Not only the U.S., but, indeed, many nations tried to deal with Milosevic and to avoid the fighting. The rest is history. For 78 days, an air war was conducted in which the United States of America flew roughly 70 percent of the missions. Five or six other nations had their fighters, and they did the best they could. It was a consortium of nations.

Why did the U.S. have the largest burden? Very simply, we had the most modern equipment. It was a high-tech war. We employed every bit of high-tech equipment that we knew how to employ to protect the lives of the aviators. That was the correct decision. We gave as much as we could to our allies, but their planes simply weren't equipped with the high-tech guidance systems, radar systems, and other detection systems to defend themselves. So we flew the bulk of the missions. NATO is still without adequate airlift. We supplied the cargo planes, the troop carriers, in large measure. In that remote location in the airfields that ring Kosovo—Italy had a dozen airfields, and how valiant that country was in that battle. They turned over much of their civil aviation, air space, and airfields to allow the U.S. and allies to operate their aircraft around the clock.

Back to this amendment. The amendment is in two parts. I will refer to it as part 1 or 2. First, it is a contribution that I made some 2½ months ago, following my most recent trip to Kosovo. I went into that region, I think for the fifth or sixth time, and I went to the headquarters of the KFOR commander,

a fine German officer, well-trained. He had a modest office. We were joined by Ambassador Kouchner, who was given by the U.N. the primary responsibility for trying to rebuild Kosovo following the termination of the conflict. This was January. I remember it well. There were 1 or 2 light bulbs sort of hanging from the ceiling, and they were constantly flickering. Down the hall was a toilet that was inoperative because there wasn't enough power. You had to flush it by taking a big bucket of water and pouring it in.

I bring this up because Ambassador Kouchner said to me repeatedly in the hour or so I was there, as the lights were flickering, "We don't have enough money from our allies that fought this war and others who made the commitment to get adequate power." He said, "Half of the city of Pristina"—that is where we were, Pristina—"is freezing tonight because of the inadequacy of the power, inadequacy of the housing, inadequacy of everything, food and the like." That was in January. That is not an American; that is a Frenchman.

The general who commented on the lights said, "This is the best building in town. We are doing our best; we are going to make it through." This was the headquarters of all the KFOR, all the troops. Up to 30 nations had contributed troops to try to bring about a measure of stability.

The consequence of that trip and going out to visit our troops in a far region—the whole area was divided into various regions: The American sector, the French sector, the British sector. I visited our troops in the American sector. I watched these young men from places all across the United States, heavily dressed in their flack suits and protective vests, cold as the dickens, carrying weapons, but going around to try to maintain order in these war-ravaged communities. There was the Serb section in the town and the Albanian section.

There was an indivisible line between them. You couldn't see it. But everybody knew you didn't step across it. There was very little, if any, contact between two factions.

I visited other American soldiers—two and three stationed out to guard a church. Our soldiers then and today are doing all kinds of tasks at personal risk, for which in large measure they weren't trained. They do not teach us in boot camp how to solve marital disputes or how to solve disputes between shop owners who are arguing.

These wonderful persons in uniform are drawing on a lifetime of American experience with their families and their homes and their towns to perform tasks that are far beyond any training the military gives. But they are doing it. They have done it, and they continue to do it, and do it very well.

At the end of the war, there were commitments in which the various allies came in and said we will send so many million dollars; we will send so many police; we will send so many

building supplies; we will do this and we will do that. Bernard Kouchner, the man in charge, simply said it is not being done.

So I came back home and concocted an amendment in consultation with quite a few of my colleagues. I went about it very deliberately. I consulted on two occasions at the White House in constructive meetings. The administration wasn't at all supportive of this venture; that is, on the face of the draft that I had. But I had other people within the administration and elsewhere telling me privately: JOHN, if you do this, I think you will get the attention of the allies and they will begin to fulfill the commitments they made. Whether they are dollar commitments, commitments for police, or other commitments; they will do it.

I came to the floor of the Senate on Monday. I had quite a few cosponsors: The distinguished Senator STEVENS, the distinguished Senator INOUE, members of the Appropriations Committee, and a great number of the Armed Services Committee. There was nothing to file the amendment against. But my intentions were that at such time as the Kosovo supplemental came through, I would put it on and have it printed in the RECORD.

This thing reverberated around the world, known as the Warner amendment. I take no great pride of authorship. But they had to name it something. But, suddenly, the allies began to get the message that we mean business in the Congress of the United States. We mean business. They began to account for what they had done. They began to expedite their dollars. They began to expedite the building materials. They began to expedite in some ways sending police, although they are still far behind the goals. Now, some 2½ months later, I have just been advised as late as yesterday by a constant stream of U.N. and E.U. officials through my office. I thank them. They quietly thanked me and those who supported me for bringing this matter out in the public and making known the need of the allies to step up.

The House of Representatives, Mr. KASICH, called me one day with great respect and said: JOHN, I think your amendment is a good one. Would you agree if I brought it up on the House floor just as it is? I said: Fine. Give it a try.

There was quite a debate in the House of Representatives on that amendment. I will put it in the RECORD later today. But it was only defeated by a very few votes with basically 200 on each side. By a very few votes did it go down, largely because a number of Members had not really had a chance to think it through.

But this amendment, which is couched as the Byrd-Warner amendment today, simply says the following: That the allies made certain commitments that, in the judgment of this Senator and such others who support those commitments, have not been kept in a timely way.

We have about 15 percent of the troops there. I want to make this clear. Other nations have 85 percent of them.

As a consequence, our troops and the troops of other nations could be there indefinitely. There is no one—I defy anyone—who can come to this floor and give with any precision the dates on which the infrastructure of that nation, and particularly its judicial system, a police system, and other necessary infrastructure, can enable the troops of this Nation and others to go home.

It seems to me they needed a wake-up call. That is precisely what this amendment does that I partly drew up. It simply says to our President: Respectfully, Mr. President, of this \$2 billion coming through, you can utilize a certain percentage right away to reimburse the Department of Defense for expenditures it has already made for the Kosovo operation for this fiscal year to replenish the funds taken out of the Department of the Army, largely, but some out of the Navy, some out of the Air Force, but 25 percent we hold back—that is all, 25 percent of \$2 billion we hold back—until you can certify that you have examined, first, the commitments of our allies, and then, second, the extent to which they have completed their commitments. I have been told on good authority that in all probability the President can make that certification largely with what has occurred in the 2½ months since this Warner section of this thing has been made public.

So my amendment in large measure has met its goal.

I thank the many people who have helped me and stood by the purpose of this amendment. But had the President not been able to certify, I said the other 25 percent of the money would then be used to bring our troops home because this Nation has fulfilled its commitment and did its best certainly in the combat phase of this. Certainly in the year almost after the combat phase, we have done it. Now let the Europeans and other nations pick up.

If there is one thing in this bill I will bring to the floor next week for the colleagues of the Armed Services Committee, the most serious thing facing us today in the military is the retention of the middle-grade personnel, enlisted and officer, because of the constant deployment of these individuals all over the world away from their families. We are not today able to retain sufficient numbers to keep this military of ours, this magnificent military of ours, strong in the future. It is not the shortage of dollars. It is not the shortage of equipment in large measure, although spare parts is a problem. It is the fact that these men and women in the uniform of our Nation are constantly being sent away on ships, flown away in airplanes, and many times with very short notice so that the remaining spouse has to pick up the responsibilities as that serviceperson goes overseas.

I just think to keep an indefinite commitment in this region without any participation by the Congress of the United States is wrong. We should speak to that, and that is what my portion does. It simply says 25 percent is to be used to bring home the troops if you can't make the certification. But if the Congress wishes, it could meet and say: Even though you could not make the certification, Mr. President, we think you should continue the policy as you have laid it out despite the inability of making the certification, despite the fact that our allies have not made their commitments. That amendment simply says we should be involved. That is what the Constitution requires. We should be involved. We cannot come in here year after year, month after month, and just stamp these appropriations with an "aye" vote and then run out of the Chamber. We have to face up to this amendment. This amendment makes us face up to it.

That is my principal contribution. I join my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator BYRD, in his portion. I see my distinguished colleague from South Carolina who worked on this and voted for it in the Appropriations Committee. I shorten my remarks so the Senator may address the Senate.

The thrust of the Byrd amendment is not "cut and run," not that we are trying to undermine NATO, that we are turning our back. It is simply saying to the Congress of the United States and to the next President, give Congress a plan and show we can pull out just the combat elements of our troops, leaving the intelligence, leaving the logistics, leaving other segments of the military to help the remaining troops of the many nations—not cut and run. Bring out the combat troops. Show Congress a plan.

Those troops, in our judgment, should be out by July 2001. Is that too much to ask, 14 months hence? That is not cut and run. That is not undermining anybody. That is not sending a signal to Milosevic that the United States is turning its back. It is saying to the men and women of our Armed Forces, to this Nation, that we have done our share. It is time for us to pick up the combat share to the extent it is still necessary. And then, if it is in the infinite wisdom of this body that we should not make any changes, we should not come home with the combat elements. All we have to do is stand up and send a message, a sense of the Congress, we think we should stay. That would add far greater strength to the conviction of the American participation than this year after year after year of idly voting on an appropriations bill and not discussing it.

I respect my dear colleague from West Virginia. How many times he has been on this floor reminding Members of our responsibilities? Many, many times. This is an amendment that simply says: Congress, the hour has arrived where you have to stand up and

be counted if we will continue for an indefinite time the missions in Kosovo.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Dear Colleague letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2000.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On May 9, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, by a bipartisan vote of 23 to 3, adopted a major policy provision relating to the ongoing role of the United States military in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation.

The Senate is expected to quickly take up the FY 2001 Military Construction Appropriations Bill, which contains the Kosovo language. As the authors of this provision, we take this opportunity to provide you with our analysis of the language and a fact sheet on the provision.

We are particularly concerned about the possibility of misconceptions or misinterpretations of the provision. The Byrd-Warner language goes directly to the institutional and constitutional responsibilities of Congress. It does not require the withdrawal of U.S. military troops from Kosovo. To the contrary, the language makes specific provisions for Congress to vote, under expedited procedures, if the next President seeks to continue U.S. military involvement in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation beyond July 1, 2001.

The provision has three main objectives. First, it terminates funding for the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President seeks and receives Congressional authorization to keep troops in Kosovo.

Second, the provision requires the President to develop a plan, in consultation with our European allies, to turn the ground combat troop element of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation entirely over to the Europeans by July 1, 2001. Assuming the President is successful in developing such a plan, there should be no need for funding the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001.

Third, related to current operations in Kosovo and to signal to the Europeans the need for them to fulfill their commitments for implementing peace and stability in Kosovo, the provision withholds 25 percent of the emergency supplemental funding for military operations Kosovo attached to the Military Construction bill pending certification by the President that our allies are making adequate progress in meeting the commitments they made to the Kosovo peacekeeping process. If the President cannot make the certifications by July 15 of this year, the funding held in reserve can only be used to withdraw U.S. forces from Kosovo unless Congress votes otherwise.

This last provision has been compared to an earlier proposal by Senator Warner, a version of which was narrowly defeated in the House. That language, however, has been modified to address a major concern expressed during the House debate; namely, that failure by the President to certify the requisite level of allied contributions would automatically trigger the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Kosovo with no opportunity for Congress or the President to intervene.

The Byrd-Warner language included in the Senate Military Construction Bill addresses that issue by including a provision for Congress to vote, under expedited procedures, to lift the troop withdrawal requirement on use of the funds held in reserve, thus disarming

the automatic trigger. Moreover, the allies appear to have gotten the message. They have in the past two months increased their contributions, and the President is expected to be able to make the required certification by July 15.

The larger issue addressed by the Byrd-Warner provision is that of the responsibility of Congress to exercise its constitutional duty. It was no accident that the founding fathers vested in Congress alone the power of the purse. Yet, we are seeking in Kosovo, as we have seen in so many other peacekeeping operations, a bastardization of that process. Instead of Congress' appropriating funds for expenditure by the Executive Branch, the Executive Branch is spending funds first and asking Congress after the fact to pay the bills.

Setting aside for a moment the foreign policy implications of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation, the Senate has a duty to vigilantly guard the rights bestowed on Congress by the Constitution. No such right is more central to the separation of powers on which our system of government is built than the vesting in Congress alone the power of the purse.

Provisions to put Congressional check reins on funding appropriated to implement U.S. foreign policy initiative are often criticized as micromanaging the Administration. Language dealing with troop drawdowns is subject to the additional criticism of endangering U.S. troops and emboldening foreign despots. The Byrd-Warner provision is carefully and deliberately designed to avoid those pitfalls.

First, the language offers guidance to the President; it does not dictate an outcome. Because the United States bore the lion's share of the air offensive against Yugoslavia, we believe that the Europeans should be responsible for the ground element of the Kosovo peacekeeping mission. The Byrd-Warner provision offers a road map to achieve that outcome by July 1, 2001. If the next President disagrees with our position, the language provides a mechanism, in the form of a joint resolution to be voted on under expedited procedures, for him to seek and receive congressional authorization to continue the deployment of U.S. ground troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001.

The provision specifically exempts from the restriction on U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo such U.S. military missions as support for NATO headquarters in Kosovo, intelligence support, air surveillance, and related activities. The United States can continue to assist NATO in Kosovo, with the exception of providing U.S. ground combat troops for the mission.

According to Administration estimates, the other NATO and non-NATO countries participating in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation are currently contributing about 85 percent of the total force structure. The Byrd-Warner provision provides ample time for those nations and others to augment their deployments of ground combat troops to Kosovo. In no way does this language undercut the NATO peacekeeping operation in Kosovo or provide encouragement to Slobodan Milosevic. If anything, it will give the Europeans the opportunity to demonstrate to the world the strength and unity of their opposition to Milosevic's brand of tyranny.

The time frames outlined in this provision are deliberate. Our intention is to shift long range decisionmaking on the role of the United States in Kosovo away from the politically charged atmosphere of an election year and into the next Administration. This language allows the next President, whoever is elected, to deal decisively with Kosovo and

prevents the U.S. from drifting, through inaction, into an indefinite and likely prolonged commitment of U.S. personnel and resources in yet another foreign peacekeeping operation.

To promote continuity between Administrations, and to ensure that the next Administration does not put off dealing with Kosovo until it is too late to plan effectively, our provision requires the current President to submit, by September 30, 2000, an interim plan for the U.S. to transition its ground combat troops out of Kosovo, and the next President to submit a final plan by May 1, 2001.

Should the Byrd-Warner language result in a drawdown of U.S. ground troops from Kosovo, the language provides for a "safe, orderly, and phased" withdrawal of troops, and leaves the planning of that withdrawal up to the President. Any troop drawdown would be managed by the generals, not the Congress.

We urge you to carefully consider the language of the Byrd-Warner provision, and we welcome your support. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Christina Evans of Senator Byrd's staff at 224-3088 or Judy Ansley of Senator Warner's staff at 224-4928.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. BYRD.
JOHN WARNER.

FACT SHEET: BYRD-WARNER KOSOVO
AMENDMENT

More than 5,500 U.S. troops are participating in the NATO peacekeeping operation in Kosovo despite the fact that Congress has never authorized, nor even formally debated, U.S. involvement in Kosovo since the Senate, on March 23, 1999, authorized air strikes against Yugoslavia.

Congress has a constitutional responsibility to address policy issues involving the deployment of U.S. troops overseas in instances, such as Kosovo, in which American men and women are being sent into potentially dangerous situations.

By tacitly endorsing, through emergency supplemental funding measures, Executive Branch decisions to deploy U.S. troops overseas without congressional authorization, Congress is effectively abrogating its responsibility under the Constitution.

This amendment terminates funding for the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President seeks and receives congressional authorization to continue such deployment.

In recognition of the fact that the United States military bore the brunt of the NATO air campaign against Yugoslavia, the amendment also requires the president to develop a plan to turn the ground combat troop element of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation entirely over to the Europeans by July 1, 2001.

The timing is a key element of the amendment. First, it shifts the responsibility of determining future U.S. involvement in Kosovo from the current Administration, which will be out of office within months, to the next Administration, which will inherit the Kosovo peacekeeping mission. Second, the amendment provides ample time for the next Administration to either develop a plan to hand off the Kosovo ground combat troop mission to the Europeans or make its case to Congress to keep U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo.

If the next President sees a compelling need to keep U.S. ground troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001, the amendment requires him to seek congressional authorization. If Congress, acting under expedited procedures,

does not authorize the continued deployment of U.S. troops in Kosovo, funding would be terminated after July 1, 2001.

As an intermediate goal, the amendment withholds 25 percent of the FY 2000 supplemental appropriations for military operations in Kosovo pending certification by the President that the Europeans are living up to their commitments, including provision of at least 33% of the commitment for monetary reconstruction assistance, 75% of the commitment for humanitarian assistance, 75% of the commitment for Kosovo government administration monetary assistance, and 75% of the commitment for civilian police.

If the President cannot make such a certification by July 15, 2000, the money being held in reserve could only be used to withdraw troops from Kosovo unless Congress, acting under expedited procedures, votes otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me first commend the chairman of our Armed Services Committee. He has been to war twice. He served as our Secretary of the Navy. He has a conscience with respect to the GIs now deployed in Kosovo. That is the reason I rise this afternoon.

My chairman, ranking member, and former majority leader, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, has a little bit of laryngitis. He is feeling well. He is at the committee markup right now with respect to the Labor, Health and Human Resources bill in appropriations over in the Hart Building. He wanted someone to be able to respond. I understood the opposition to this particular amendment were on their way to the floor. That is why I came. Maybe the better part of wisdom would be to say thank you and there is no debate, and when we get in one, then Senator BYRD can speak for himself.

However, I share that concern for our troops, their morale and the deployment of a so-called peacekeeping mission. There isn't any peace. There isn't any policy. All we have to do is look at the record. The record shows best that we debated airstrikes and we were split down the middle, 58-41, March 23, under the Biden amendment. We had the McCain amendment deploying armed forces in Kosovo, saying let's go to war. That was May 4, 1999. It was tabled by a motion of 78-22.

The record shows, at best, we have a lukewarm endorsement, maybe favoring some airstrikes, but against taking the life of a GI. That is the military policy right now. With respect to diplomacy, the policy is one of a so-called multiethnic society, as I remember Secretary Albright saying.

I visited Kosovo shortly after the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee did this year. I was never briefed on the importance of a multiethnic society . . . maybe the region should be partitioned. But that isn't the policy of the United States. I tried to verify the multiethnic policy with all of our experts deployed there—

the Army generals, the Navy admirals, and everyone else. I could find no support for any kind of multiethnic society in light of what was going on on the ground.

Here we have another Vietnam, not in the sense of deploying more and more troops, but actually having a military deployment in an impossible situation. Don't go forward, don't go backward, just stay there; we will send movies. It is sort of embarrassing to see our military hunkered down like chickens in a hailstorm at Camp Bonsteel and everybody bragging that we have wooden buildings and catwalks through the snow and we can get hamburgers at McDonald's. That is not for the GI, the one who volunteers to serve in the military. He is looking to be trained and go to battle for our national security.

To address these conditions that continue and languish is a reason I am confident Senator BYRD introduced his amendment, which is part of our bill. And certainly it is my feeling, likewise, that we have a responsibility here.

The other day we had the 25th anniversary of Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense said, almost 25 years later, it was a mistake. Are we going to have to wait 25 years to resolve Kosovo? Bosnia was to last 1 year. That policy has been going on for 5, 6 years now.

We just cannot willy-nilly go along with mixed policies. Of course, the clarion call for the Kosovo initiative was ethnic cleansing. At the time they were briefing us, they had 100,000 Albanians living peacefully in Belgrade. Milosevic lived down the street. Heavens above, this was not the Holocaust. Everybody confuses ethnic cleansing with enemy cleansing. When you start bombing somebody and you make that the enemy, an outright open warfare, then the other side has got the right, title, and interest to clear the area of any on the side of the enemy. More ethnic cleansing occurred after the bombing than before the bombing. Actually, it was enemy cleansing because Milosevic is a cagey fellow and a scoundrel and we all know it. He says to himself, whoopee, now I can go in there and get rid of the real Albanians that have been giving me problems down there in Kosovo. And he did it.

That is exactly what was happening. The talk now is trying to deal with, ex post facto, a million refugees spilling over into Macedonia, down into Albania and back up into Montenegro and elsewhere. But the real spilling over and the cleansing was enemy cleansing. We are trying to talk about war and victory, trying to give dignity to a mistake.

No. 1, it was a flawed policy from the word go. We came in where there weren't any guys with the white hats. It wasn't the good guys versus the bad guys. Anybody who knows anything about Kosovo and this part of the world knows that both sides are really something else. I would not want an American to go to battle for either side. I

say that advisedly because it has been proven. When we went there earlier this year, what did we learn? Yes, there was violence upon violence upon violence. It was continuing. And 95 percent of the violence was being inflicted by Albanian on Albanian.

It is interesting to me to see here, recently, in *The Economist*, that:

The war has done nothing to bring the two sides together. On the contrary, it has intensified ancient animosities.

Then going down it says:

At present, the Albanians can look to NATO for their security and to the U.N. for their administration, while many of them traffic in drugs and other contraband and generally profit from the legal limbo in which they live.

Peacekeeping? Where is the peace? Where is the peace? We are now saying we have a deployment for peacekeeping. It is an enforced cease-fire.

I was briefed by the brass in Kosovo. They said both sides ran out of targets. We hit all the targets we wanted to hit. We were even going up there knocking out the Chinese Embassy.

Of course, Milosevic had gotten rid of everything and cleansed everything he possibly could. What a wonderful war. We won. Now we want to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Come on, don't give us that.

We were there in the little town of Urosevac. The President visited that town at Christmas time. They had a big show. They had 400-some troops, and they all were hunkered down in the city hall. You could tell the 65,000 or 70,000 residents of the town were not friendly. We drove around and they glowered at us. They were in charge. We were not in charge of the town the President was in. We were not in charge of anything, really, in Kosovo. We have deployments here with walls around them, fences and everything else. We do not wander down the street or outside the compound.

Similarly, in Mitrovica, we have a GI at one end of the block, a GI at the other end of the block, and a GI in the middle of the block on a 24-hour, three times eight, 24-hour routine, guarding people going to the grocery store.

It's public knowledge what the reporter says in *The Economist* about this thing not working:

The war has done nothing to bring the two sides together. On the contrary, it has intensified ancient animosities.

There are the soldiers in the peacekeeping force, having to spend 6 months away from their families. People hate to waste time. We, in the Senate, we love wasting time. There is nothing to do tomorrow and nothing on Monday. We cannot wait for November and the Presidential election to be over with so we can all go back to work. But the normal attitude is not to waste time and, you see, that is exactly what is happening in Kosovo.

I finally understood about the Albanians when I was in London and I met with one of the leaders of Parliament. He said the Albanians are bringing 14-

and 15-year-old girls to Portsmouth and forcing them into prostitution. They have drugs all over England now. He said: It's the worst threat and problem that we have here in England. He said: I never thought I would ever say anything good about Milosevic, but I can sort of understand his problem.

That is not to say Milosevic is a good guy, or the Albanians are all bad. But you generally get a feel for what is out there and what is going on when responsible people tell you: Look, all the Afghanistan drugs are coming up through Kosovo, and into Europe. Instead of keeping the peace, we are keeping the flow of drugs.

The GI with any common sense is saying to himself: Where is this peace we have here? We have one fellow who murdered another one but we had to let him go in 48 hours because we only had 93 slots in the prison and the United Nations had not supplied a police force. The United Nations had not supplied a court system. The United Nations had not put up their money for a prison system.

So we go right to the ultimatum. If this is diplomacy, let me quote none other than our friend, the former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger:

Rambouillet was not a negotiation—as is often claimed—but an ultimatum. This marked an astounding departure for an administration that had entered office proclaiming its devotion to the UN Charter and multilateral procedures.

And on and on.

The transformation of Alliance from a defensive military grouping into an institution prepared to impose its values by force occurred in the same month that three former Soviet satellites joined NATO.

That is none other than Kissinger himself. In that light, I am glad we did not send Secretary Albright to Northern Ireland. We sent Senator George Mitchell instead. But under the Albright policy, you either agree by 12 o'clock midnight or we go bombing. Come on. This thing is afoul, amiss, and a mistake, and we don't have to wait for 25 years to know it. Those are my words, the words of the Senator from South Carolina, and not the words of the Senator from West Virginia. He will be glad at the first of the week—I am confident he will be in good shape again. He will explain it, no doubt, to everyone's satisfaction.

We all agree on one thing. With GIs deployed on account of our mistakes, we are going to give them every dollar necessary, every benefit, every support we possibly can.

We cannot possibly continue day in and day out in limbo with a flawed policy and act like it is a policy. It is a nonpolicy and a flawed policy and a mistaken policy. We have to somehow bring it to a head.

How do we do that in a deliberate, tactful manner? What we say is: Look, get these countries of the U.N. to support it.

Of course, we learned at the briefings that the Greeks were not for it in their

sector. They did not like it. The French, are *comme ci comme ca*. The Soviets never were for it, and they do not adhere to us. NATO responds to Moscow. The Brits are pulling out. In one place they pulled out, 3 hours later a church was burned.

I asked our British friends what their reason for pulling out was and they said they were too stretched. We are stretched, too. We have nine peacekeeping missions. We have Kosovo, Sierra Leone, the Congo, and East Timor. There are four more we are going to be asking for. The GIs are given a policeman's duty in a totally hostile place where one cannot take sides and one has to defend oneself and not act like an authority on keeping the peace but, by gosh, keep out of trouble.

We are not in charge in Kosovo, nor is the U.N., nor is NATO. We have invaded a sovereign country without a full debate. We made that mistake in Vietnam. We have the feeling of responsibility. I understand the distinguished Senator from Arizona is very much in favor of Kosovo. I could have saved him 4 or 5 years in prison if I knew at the time I got to the Senate in 1966 that McNamara felt Vietnam was a mistake.

Come on. Are we going to continue just because we do not want to send a message to Milosevic? Do my colleagues really think that Milosevic does not know what is going on? He has already removed the opposition authorities in Montenegro. If he went in there tonight, what would we do? Nothing. He is corralling his support. Read this week's *Time* magazine about what the Air Force did not hit. I wish my colleagues would get a copy and read it because it reports we were misled in that particular briefing about how we destroyed so many tanks, so many planes, so many targets; we just ruined the country.

Our distinguished friend, the Secretary of State, said: Give peace a chance; it takes time to get the roads and the bridges and industry and the hospitals and the air fields all repaired.

I remember a visit I had when I first came to the Senate. I was at the Connaught in London having dinner with Martin Agronsky who had been behind the lines in Northern Ireland for a 3-week period. He came out in despair. He said: That crowd is never going to get together.

Fortunately, under the leadership of President Clinton and Senator Mitchell, there was a break last Friday, and, finally, the IRA says they are going to disarm, and it looks like it might work.

For 30 years, they have had the infrastructure—the roads, the bridges, the hospitals, the universities. I have been to Northern Ireland. Some sections of Belfast have better housing than my hometown. With all that infrastructure, the British troops are still deployed years and years later.

Is that the policy of the United States of America with our GIs? That

is why we rise this afternoon and are ready, willing, and able to draw some lines that are understandable that will develop into a firm policy.

If the U.N. wants to get in there, fine, but if they are not going to support it, then we have a problem. I will never forget the story about Vaclav Havel saying he hoped Secretary Albright could come back to the Czech Republic, her native land, and succeed him as President. He said the one difficulty was that 75 percent of the people of the Czech Republic opposed "Madeleine's war."

Take a rollcall. Go up to the U.N. See how enthused they are about the non-policy.

Quit giving this patina of deliberation and positivity by doing nothing and keeping the troops out there and praying like we all do that no one gets assaulted or loses a life at Bonsteel. We have an impossible situation. It is not going to get better in the foreseeable future. We ought to bring it to a head and certainly let the next President, whomever that is, have a 6-month period to review the mistake we made and say: Wait a minute, it was not a mistake.

I do not mind if they are right and I am wrong. I can tell my colleagues right now though, unfortunately, I think I gave the right vote when I opposed the Biden amendment.

I appreciate the leadership and the conscientious approach the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has given this responsibility. We are not trying to embarrass the President. We are not trying to take a political position. On the contrary, I have my GIs out there. I saw what happened in Vietnam, and I saw what happened in Somalia. If it had not been for the Byrd amendment, we could possibly still be there.

This is a similar call to arms politically for us to set the policy and do so in a judicious way. We all know they want to try to subvert it; they do not want to talk about it. With this crowd in Washington, you have to be on message: Let's not talk about it because it might get on to the weekend shows, and if it gets on to the weekend shows, it might send the wrong message to Milosevic. Bah humbug to Milosevic. I am trying to send a message to those fellows at Bonsteel. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from South Carolina. I remember when I first came to the Senate 22 years ago, two-thirds of the Senate or more had the opportunity to serve in uniform. Today, there are fewer. I cast no aspersion against those who do not. It is just a generational thing.

Listening to my dear friend from South Carolina, I know he draws on his experiences in the army in World War II as a young officer in the battle to free Europe when he had the responsi-

bility of life. No one else but him, as an officer, had the responsibility for those young men under his command.

This type of amendment we discussed—certainly I have and others—with many veterans who have worn the uniform of this country and many who are on active duty today.

The distinguished Senator said he has seen war. I saw it in the continental limits in World War II, and then I had a brief tour in Korea as a ground officer with an air wing. I saw the others who had to fight it, but I never put myself in the category of a combat soldier. I have always said my orders did not take me there, but they took the Senator there and he saw it.

I know in the course of this debate, the issue will be raised: We may be putting the young men and women in the Armed Forces in jeopardy as a consequence of this amendment, even the act of filing it and debating it.

I want to get into that. I am sure the Senator will rejoin in this debate if and when that happens.

I see our distinguished colleague here, who is a naval veteran, who is about to speak. I do not know if it is on this matter or on another matter. It is not on this matter.

But I am willing to join in that debate. When 23 members of the Appropriations Committee voted "yea" to put this in—and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina can correct me—but of that group who voted "yea," the following have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country: Senator COCHRAN, Senator SPECTER, Senator GORTON, Senator BURNS, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Senator DANIEL INOUE, Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, Senator HERBERT KOHL, and Senator STEVENS, the chairman. They are veterans.

Let us debate it, but let us debate it with great care.

The letter which I put in the RECORD from Senator BYRD and myself states our point of view. This letter is just going out to Members, but already the following cosponsors, who likewise were veterans, have signed on: Senator ROBERTS, Senator STROM THURMOND, Senator INHOFE, Senator ROBERT SMITH, and Senator SESSIONS. So a goodly number of those who have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country have joined behind this.

We would not have done it, I say to the Senator, if we had had a moment's concern we were increasing the risk to our people. They are at risk today. They will be at risk tomorrow and the next day. And as we are drifting into this endless—endless—commitment, they are at risk every single day.

This amendment simply says: Congress, either join with the President or state your case and bring them home. That is the purpose of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator HARKIN for up to 20 minutes, Senator HELMS for up to 10 minutes, and Senators ROBERTS and CLELAND in control of 60 minutes total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to make my presentation seated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 306 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

DAMS IN WASHINGTON AND OREGON

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is flying to Oregon this evening, or tomorrow morning, for a visit to that State. On the last five or six occasions on which he has visited the State of Washington, I have inquired of him, as politely as possible, as to his intentions with respect to the future of four dams on the Snake River. This inquiry is of significant importance to the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of the State of Oregon. The answer from the Vice President is peculiarly important because of the disarray of the present administration. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recommended that the dams come down, be removed, for salmon recovery. The Corps of Engineers, almost a year ago, was ready to recommend that the dams stay in place and that we deal with salmon recovery in another productive fashion. That recommendation was vetoed by the White House and removed physically from the Corps of Engineers' report.

More recently, the National Marine Fishery Service has said that we don't know enough to decide whether or not we should remove the dams and that the decision may be at least 5 or 10 years away. The Governor of Oregon has recommended that the dams come down. The Governor of Washington, also a Democrat, has opposed that recommendation. As you know, Mr. President, so have I, in the most vehement possible terms. Of all of the proposals for salmon recovery, dam removal is, first, the most ineffective and, second, of the most marginal utility with respect to the recovery of the salmon resource in the Pacific Northwest.

At a capital expenditure of \$1 billion to \$2 billion, and annual losses of at

least a third of a billion dollars in perpetuity, the promise of salmon recovery from dam removal is extremely marginal, with no impact on some of the endangered runs, and only a modest improvement in the order of 10 to 20 percent in the prospects for certain other runs. Weighed against that are the potential real successes from the Salmon Recovery Board of the State of Washington, which has for the current year an appropriation from the Congress of \$18 million for the work of citizen-based salmon recovery teams, which will be the beneficiary of an appropriation from this body of about \$4 million.

There is a very real concern with predation at the mouth of the Columbia River—a concern now frustrated by a lawsuit against any removal of Caspian terns from an artificial island at the mouth of the river by at least a temporary injunction. These and dozens of other projects in the Pacific Northwest have a far greater promise for the salmon recovery than does dam removal, with all of its devastating impacts on the loss of benign, renewable energy power, to be substituted by the use of fossil fuels, for all of the loss of agricultural land that requires irrigation to be anything other than a desert, for all the loss of a transportation system which is the most efficient and environmentally benign for the transportation of grain to ports on the lower Columbia River.

All of these factors argue against dam removal. But the Vice President of the United States, in his candidacy for President of the United States, refuses to make any commitment whatsoever on this matter. Now, it may be that he didn't want to respond to this Senator on these visits to the State of Washington. But he is now going to be asked to respond by the Governor of Oregon, who supports his candidacy. His response has been demanded by the Portland Oregonian, the largest newspaper in the State of Oregon, which, incidentally, holds my position and that of my colleague, Senator SMITH of Oregon, on the subject. One hopes that the Vice President will finally be able to come up with an opinion. Now, he has taken positions on other local issues. He is certainly quite willing to tell the people of South Carolina what flag they can fly. But he seems unwilling to tell the people of Washington and Oregon what his views are on an issue of vital importance to them and to their regional economy.

So I am here to express the hope that the Vice President will finally come clean with his views on this subject. But I must express the expectation that he will, once again, dodge the issue, pretend that he has not made up his mind when, in fact, he has, and claim that he can't make a substantive comment on this until after the election in November is over. I will regret that, Mr. President. His opponent, the Governor of Texas, has taken the forthright stand that it is improper and un-

economical and unwise to remove those dams. He will protect the physical infrastructure of the Pacific Northwest. I am here to invite the Vice President of the United States to do likewise, without, I regret to say, any expectation that he is willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Georgia.

DIALOG ON AMERICA'S GLOBAL ROLE III, MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS, to continue our dialog on the global role of the United States. This is the third such dialog in what we have intended to be a year-long series. In February, we began by taking a broad look at the priorities and approaches of U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold-war period. A few weeks ago we narrowed the focus somewhat by trying to define and defend our national interest, which must be the first step in arriving at a coherent national security strategy.

Today, as we start to go from general principles to concrete applications, Senator ROBERTS and I, along with several of our colleagues, will attempt to zero in on the U.S. role in multilateral organizations which strongly impact our national security, especially NATO and the U.N.

I have just returned from a trip to Brussels and Italy where we were briefed on the air campaign from Aviano Air Base. In Brussels, I met with the Deputy Secretary General of NATO. As I said, Italy and then on to Macedonia, where we saw the regions where the refugees were kept during the war in Kosovo. Then, into Kosovo itself.

I met with key military leaders and key political leaders from the United States, European nations, and NATO. These meetings only served to reinforce my strong belief that there is a pressing need to address the global role of the United States, both in our own national strategic planning and in NATO's planning. This conclusion is not a result of the recent actions taken in Serbia and Kosovo. Rather, these actions were merely symptomatic of, I think, the problem.

A large portion of the military operation in Kosovo was supplied by the United States. I believe it is now time for the United States to lead in finding a political solution. Similarly, I believe the time has come to "Europeanize" the peace in Bosnia and Kosovo. While the soldiers I spoke with at Camp Bond steel certainly displayed high morale, reflected in the excellent job they actually have done, if we stay in the Balkans indefinitely with no clear way out, I believe we run an increasing risk of further overextending our military, thus exacerbating our recruitment and retention problems and lessening our capability to respond to more serious challenges to our vital national interests.

From my perspective, the basic problem in the Balkans today is political, not military, and requires a political rather than military solution. Essentially, at this point in time, the various communities wish to live apart and exercise self-determination along ethnic lines. I would agree that such a development is unfortunate and not in keeping with our American view of the way the world should be. However, for any solution to the current situation to be acceptable to the parties directly involved—and, thus, durable—this inescapable fact must be taken into account.

On June 30 of last year, the Senate accepted by voice vote my amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which expressed "the sense of the Senate that the United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans" to develop a final political settlement of both the Kosovo and Bosnia conflicts.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1163 TO S. 1234, FISCAL YEAR 2000 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS SUPPORTING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO ACHIEVE A DURABLE POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IN THE BALKANS

(Adopted by Senate by unanimous consent on 6/30/99)

SEC. X. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BALKANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted large-scale military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) At the conclusion of 78 days of these hostilities, the United States and its NATO allies suspended military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia based upon credible assurances by the latter that it would fulfill the following conditions as laid down by the so called Group of Eight (G-8):

(A) An immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

(B) Staged withdrawal of all Yugoslav military, police and paramilitary forces from Kosovo.

(C) Deployment in Kosovo of effective international and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the agreed objectives.

(D) Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo, to be decided by the United Nations Security Council which will seek to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

(E) Provision for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons from Kosovo and an unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

(3) These objectives appear to have been fulfilled, or to be in the process of being fulfilled, which has led the United States and its NATO allies to terminate military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(4) The G-8 also called for a comprehensive approach to the economic development and

stabilization of the crisis region, and the European Union has announced plans for \$1,500,000,000 over the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Kosovo, for the convening in July of an international donors' conference for Kosovo aid, and for subsequent provision of reconstruction aid to the other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities followed by reconstruction aid directed at the Balkans region as a whole;

(5) The United States and some of its NATO allies oppose the provision of any aid, other than limited humanitarian assistance, to Serbia until Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is out of office.

(6) The policy of providing reconstruction aid to Kosovo and other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities while withholding such aid for Serbia presents a number of practical problems, including the absence in Kosovo of financial and other institutions independent of Yugoslavia, the difficulty in drawing clear and enforceable distinctions between humanitarian and reconstruction assistance, and the difficulty in reconstructing Montenegro in the absence of similar efforts in Serbia.

(7) In any case, the achievement of effective and durable economic reconstruction and revitalization in the countries of the Balkans is unlikely until a political settlement is reached as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

(8) The G-8 proposed a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement for a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking into full account the final Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, also known as the Rambouillet Accords, and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region, and the demilitarization of the UCK (Kosovo Liberation Army).

(9) The G-8 proposal contains no guidance as to a final political settlement for Kosovo and Yugoslavia, while the original position of the United States and the other participants in the so-called Contact Group on this matter, as reflected in the Rambouillet Accords, called for the convening of an international conference, after three years, to determine a mechanism for a final settlement of Kosovo status based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

(10) The current position of the United States and its NATO allies as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia calls for an autonomous, multiethnic, democratic Kosovo which would remain as part of Serbia, and such an outcome is not supported by any of the Parties directly involved, including the governments of Yugoslavia and Serbia, representatives of the Kosovar Albanians, and the people of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Kosovo.

(11) There has been no final political settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the armed forces of the United States, its NATO allies, and other non-Balkan nations have been enforcing an uneasy peace since 1996, at a cost to the United States alone of over \$10,000,000,000 with no clear end in sight to such enforcement.

(12) The trend throughout the Balkans since 1990 has been in the direction of ethnically-based particularism, as exemplified by the 1991 declarations of independence from Yugoslavia by Slovenia and Croatia, and the country in the Balkans which currently comes the closest to the goal of a democratic government which respects the human rights of its citizens is the nation of Slovenia, which was the first portion of the

former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to secede and is also the nation in the region with the greatest ethnic homogeneity, with a population which is 91 percent Slovene.

(13) The boundaries of the various national and sub-national divisions in the Balkans have been altered repeatedly throughout history, and international conferences have frequently played the decisive role in fixing such boundaries in the modern era, including the Berlin Congress of 1878, the London Conference of 1913, and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

(14) The development of an effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces, including the armed forces of the United States, its NATO allies, Russia, and any other nation from outside the Balkans which has such forces in the Balkans is in the best interests of all such nations.

(15) The ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces, accompanied by the establishment of durable and peaceful relations among all of the nations and peoples of the Balkans is in the best interests of those nations and peoples;

(16) An effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces is contingent upon the achievement of a lasting political settlement for the region, and only such a settlement, acceptable to all parties involved, can ensure the fundamental goals of the United States of peace, stability and human rights in the Balkans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans, under the auspices of the United Nations, and based upon the principles of the Rambouillet Accords for a final settlement of Kosovo status, namely that such a settlement should be based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act;

(2) The international conference on the Balkans should also be empowered to seek a final settlement for Bosnia-Herzegovina based on the same principles as specified for Kosovo in the Rambouillet Accords; and

(3) In order to produce a lasting political settlement in the Balkans acceptable to all parties, which can lead to the departure from the Balkans in timely fashion of all foreign military forces, including those of the United States, the international conference should have the authority to consider any and all of the following: political boundaries; humanitarian and reconstruction assistance for all nations in the Balkans; stationing of UN peacekeeping forces along international boundaries; security arrangements and guarantees for all of the nations of the Balkans; and tangible, enforceable and verifiable human rights guarantees for the individuals and peoples of the Balkans.

Mr. CLELAND. I truly believe that such an approach is the best, if not the only, way to resolve the difficulties in Bosnia and Kosovo—allowing our troops eventually to come home but avoiding an unacceptable security vacuum in southeast Europe—and is definitely in the best interest of the United States and Europe.

Two years ago this week, the Senate was debating the expansion of NATO, and I should add that I found that discussion to be perhaps the finest deliberation on national security issues that I have witnessed in the time I have served in the U.S. Senate. The de-

bate raised serious questions regarding both the makeup and purpose of NATO, but, in the end, I, and a large majority of the Senate, concluded that extension of NATO membership to Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary was in our, and NATO's, best interest because NATO was the only entity ready and able to fill the security void in north-eastern Europe.

Much has changed in the time since that vote, including the launching of the first offensive military operations in the history of the alliance last year in Kosovo and Serbia, an action which also represented the first time NATO asserted the right to intervene in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. Both of these were significant departures from the Senate's understanding of NATO as expressed during that debate as well as the representations we made to other nations, most notably Russia, about the goals and the intentions of NATO in the aftermath its eastward expansion. Specifically, section 3 of the Senate Resolution of Ratification affirmed that the "core mission" of NATO remains "collective self-defense," and we sought to calm Russian anxieties by pointing to the 50-year record of NATO in never launching offensive operations, and never violating the sovereignty of states except in pursuit of collective self-defense.

Since we voted for NATO expansion we have also witnessed the issuance of a new Strategic Concept for NATO, in April of 1999, and here again, the results were not exactly as anticipated at the time of the Senate's ratification vote on NATO expansion 2 years ago. For a particularly insightful and detailed treatment of this subject, I would commend to all Senators a May 24, 1999 floor statement by my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, which dissected in some detail the numerous departures from the Senate's 1998 Resolution of Ratification in the April 1999 NATO Strategic Concept.

For purposes of today's discussion on how multilateral organizations impact on the U.S. global role, I would like to highlight just two of the issues identified by Senator ROBERTS: the central issue of NATO's purpose, or "core mission," and the matter of how European nations should provide for their own defense, the so-called European Security and Defense Identity.

For its first 50 years, which culminated in its victory in the Cold War without ever having to fight a battle, the core purpose of NATO, recognized by friend and foe alike, was set forth in article 5 of the North Atlantic treaty of April 4, 1949:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and

in concert with other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

In contrast, the new NATO Strategic Concept goes well beyond the traditional collective security role in its aspirations for NATO. Item 24 in the April 24, 1999 text states that:

Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Article 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage, and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources.

I wonder if NATO is designed to track terrorism around the world, sabotage around the world, and organized crime around the world.

I continue to quote:

The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance.

Item 10 in that document includes as "fundamental security tasks" for NATO the traditional objectives of security, consultation, and deterrence and defense, as well as "crisis management," within which allies are "to stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity of Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations."

I wonder if NATO has become not a self-defense organization but a crisis management and crisis intervention organization. I wonder.

I point out that Article 7 of the NATO Treaty says that:

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

While some Western observers, especially in the United States, maintain that the 1999 Strategic Concept does not represent a significant change in NATO's policy, I believe that the Norwegian newspaper, *Oslo Aftenposten*, was much closer to the mark when it wrote last April that:

In its new "strategic concept" NATO has approved a radical expansion of the alliance's tasks, both geographically and with regard to content. From now on it will be the alliance's task to promote "security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area" by "becoming actively involved in dealing with crises, including operations in response to crises." We see the first example in Kosovo.

It is my view that the members of the NATO alliance, and especially the United States, need to think much more carefully about the expanded aspirations of their new strategic concept, and the costs—economic, political, and human resource—they are willing and able to pay in pursuit of these aspirations. Specifically, at the

very least I believe both Houses of Congress, especially this House, the Senate, need to undertake a thorough series of hearings on the strategic concept and the future of NATO.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I could not urge this set of hearings more strongly.

The Norwegian paper goes on to say that:

It is also new and important that the alliance said "yes" at the summit meeting to the desire of the EU countries to play a more independent role and thus acquire greater political weight in the NATO cooperation. Behind this also lies a desire for a cautious counterweight to a United States that is perhaps more strongly dominant now, militarily and politically, than ever before in NATO's history.

Distinguished colleagues, this leads to my other major concern about the United States and NATO: the question of a "more independent role" for the European Union countries. John Keegan, one of the world's leading military historians, summed up the current debate in an article last December. He said:

Though it has long been American policy to encourage European political and economic integration on the model of its own federal structure, the United States is far less ready to welcome moves by the Europeans to go their own strategic way. There are two reasons for that. The first is that the United States sees its own security as inextricably bound up within the alliance system in which it is a partner. The second is that it doubts the ability of the Europeans to construct parallel systems which will deliver military value. . . . The Americans are right to regard all current European attempts, either through the European Union, or the belatedly revived Western European Union or through ad hoc arrangements such as the newly announced Anglo-French force, to bypass NATO as damaging to the security structure that already exists.

Despite its advances in economic integration, the European community still lags far behind in developing a common national security structure. As we witnessed in Bosnia, and most recently Kosovo, Europe lacks either the will or the means, or both, to conduct independent military operations even in its own backyard. And whatever the end result of the recent European Security and Defense Initiative, or Identity it will be many years before the Europeans can develop a military capable of significant action independent of the United States. When one adds the additional questions of national sovereignty, domestic pressures to cut defense spending, and, of course, the need for consensus on how and when to take military action, the challenges facing the Europeans are daunting indeed.

Until Europe can surmount these challenges, which, most likely, will be many years from now, American involvement and leadership via NATO will still be seen, by Europeans at least, as essential. On my recent trip, I was discussing the role of the United States in Europe with the Deputy Secretary of NATO, Sergio Balanzio, when

he told me that the United States is, "a European power whether you like it or not—obviously, indicating we are a European power, whether we like it or not, in Europe and in the Balkans. I responded that it is one thing to be on the point of the spear and to bear the heavy load in certain cases, as the U.S. did in Bosnia and Kosovo, but quite another to always be called upon to ride to the rescue, even in Europe itself.

Going back to 1949, when NATO was formed, one of the quotes that rings in my ears is a quote from Lord Ismay, the first Secretary General of NATO. When he was asked the purpose of NATO, Lord Ismay said: The purpose of NATO is to keep the Americans in, the Russians out, and the Germans down.

I have serious reservations about that particular mission statement now. There is no need to keep the Russians out. As a matter of fact, we are wrapping our arms around the big bear in every way in every trade agreement, every cooperative agreement we can possibly put together. Secondly, there is no need to keep the Germans down. They are an emerging strong force on the European continent.

I wonder, though, having just come back from dealing with my NATO friends and our NATO allies, and having gone to Kosovo, whether the real ultimate purpose of NATO for the Europeans now is to keep the Americans in.

Personally, I do not mind sharing power. I do mind always being the lead dog that is called upon to bear the burden. I think more and more Americans are feeling that way themselves.

For me, however, the bottom line is that, despite all of the difficulties, despite the possibility that there may well be some short-term disadvantages for the United States, I believe the United States must, I repeat must, be unequivocally supportive of the development of a strong, independent European military capability to accompany Europe's growing economic and political integration. There is at present, and for the foreseeable future, no overwhelming threat to European security such as that posed by the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact. Europe should be able to attend to its own defenses in the post-Cold War world. The fact that it has not done so is certainly attributable to many factors, especially its divided and conflict-ridden history, but if it does not act now—when the threat is so low—then when will it?

Developing the necessary support structures, both political and military, to produce an effective European security identity will be neither quick, nor easy, nor cheap. But they have to start sometime, and while the United States must avoid precipitous actions—such as threatening a unilateral troop pull-out—I believe we must clearly signal that we fully understand and support moves toward greater European self-defense capabilities. Such moves may well produce some short-term redundancies and inefficiencies in

NATO, but I believe that unless we encourage the Europeans to develop their own capabilities for their own defense, we will not see the kind of increased defense efforts that Europe ought to undertake. Certainly American taxpayers have done their share, throughout most of the 20th Century, to contribute to European security.

I think British Prime Minister Tony Blair said it best in a November 22, 1999 speech in London. He said:

We must shape European Defence policy in a way designed to strengthen (the) transatlantic bond by making NATO a more balanced partnership, and by giving Europeans the capacity to act whenever the United States, for its own reasons, decides not to be involved. Only then will Europe pull its weight in world security and share more of the burden with the United States.

I could not have said it better.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, my friend and colleague in these dialogs on the U.S. global role in the world, Mr. ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, let me again thank my good friend and a distinguished American hero and statesman, the Senator from Georgia, for setting in motion our bipartisan foreign policy dialog. His common sense approach and his insightfulness to our country's national security obligations, I think, have been most helpful and most educational.

I say to the Senator, I believe and I hope that our endeavor is accomplishing the original goals we outlined in our first dialog. Our dialog has attracted attention from the media, and some academics. We have been invited to participate in various academic panel discussions and foreign policy dialogs.

I hope both our colleagues and the American public have been paying attention to our effort to come to grips with America's role in an environment so different that we cannot even name it, other than calling it the post-Cold War period.

When I have the opportunity to go back to Kansas and address the issue of what our vital national security interests are; I realize foreign policy is not a very bright return on the public radar screen which is unfortunate.

Robert Kagan recently stated that the campaign for the Presidency should focus more on foreign policy. I certainly think that is the case. He asked a simple question, "Is the world a safer place than it was 8 years ago?" His article took us on a world tour of uncertainties, specifically identifying Iraq, the Balkans, China, Taiwan, and weapons of mass destruction proliferation, Haiti, Colombia and Russia.

A realistic evaluation of emerging patterns in the world lead us to the fact that the world is dangerously close to coming apart at the seams. It is time for a serious debate about foreign policy, and this dialog we have started is a small step in that direction.

In our last dialog Senator CLELAND and I discussed the importance of identifying and establishing levels of priority to our U.S. vital national interests. Many other think tanks and foreign policy organizations have recommended a similar priority ranking. I noticed the other day in an article that Vice President GORE has recently articulated, a new kind of foreign policy suggestion—a new agenda—adding the destruction of the natural environment and the AIDS pandemic overseas as "a threat to U.S. national security interests." These unique and unprecedented issues are important issues, however, they have never made the cut in any other U.S. national interest lists. They definitely did not make the cut in the last bipartisan dialog that I had with my friend and colleague from Georgia. Nonetheless, it is a healthy debate, and I think it is a very proper debate for our country and the Presidential candidates.

What did make the cut is the fact that the United States does not want a hostile regional hegemon to develop in Europe or Asia. And then, in the meantime, what happened in the Balkans post-Bosnia and post-Kosovo is the fact that we have a paradox of enormous irony. The irony is the United States continues in the role of being a world hegemon, or superpower—the only one. Some critics say we have developed into a humanitarian world global cop and our actions and means are viewed by them as contrary to their own national interests.

Mr. President, the consequence of the U.S. role is the rest of the world is responding as any sovereign nation would respond to a hegemon.

Former Ambassador Bob Ellsworth, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and Dr. Michael May, wrote in the Los Angeles Times that U.S. military forces are so large, so advanced technologically, and so active all over the world, that a climate of "hegemony envy" has developed in key strategic areas in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East.

Ambassador Ellsworth explains, the U.S. post-Cold War, change in posture from defense and deterrence to enlargement and offense, and the Clinton doctrine proclaiming and executing intervention around the world in regard to a rather questionable definition of U.S. vital national interests is creating antihegemonic coalitions against the United States.

This current trend of both allies and nonallies asserting themselves against the U.S. is a very troubling digression.

The Nobel Prize novelist and diplomat, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, observed that "President Clinton has found the political legacy he wants to leave behind: The Imperial American Model." Obviously, that depiction of American foreign policy is counter to the goal of multilateral cooperation in the world today.

As Senator CLELAND stated, our third dialog today will focus on the role of

multilateral organizations in foreign policy.

What are we talking about? Well, currently the United States is a member of a staggering 90 multilateral organizations and numerous other bilateral agreements. It took a great deal of effort by staff and by research specialists to determine the number of multilateral organizations where the U.S. is obligated. I venture to guess, I say to my colleague, that the State Department, the Department of Defense, the Congress, and most foreign policy experts really don't have any idea individually or collectively of the responsibilities, commitments, or obligations or the money that these organizations require of the U.S. all throughout the world.

Richard Haass of the Brookings Institution tried to tackle the issue of how much the U.S. should try to do, largely or entirely on its own—unilaterally—depending on the policy priorities or the level of U.S. national interests versus how much the U.S. should do in cooperation with others. He articulated that the choice is very complicated, as the multilateral options subsume multiple approaches of multiple organizations, including using the U.N. and other international institutions, alliances, and other regional organizations, and coalitions of those able and willing to act.

The fact is, the U.S. almost never acts unilaterally, and it probably should not. The U.S. has fought five major wars during the 20th century, and in each of these conflicts the U.S. operated as part of an alliance or a coalition. The recent U.S. actions all were conducted in conjunction with forces from other nations, even as our military superiority has reached a level unmatched in history.

Therefore, if the U.S. is going to operate within the constraints of multilateral organizations—and that appears to be the case—the U.S. must structure alliances in such a way that promotes our national interests and ensures that U.S. power is not undermined.

The following list of multilateral organizations associated with countries that the U.S. has current, ongoing operations is staggering: Iraq, 23; East Timor, 5; Korea, 42; Kosovo, 6; Yugoslavia, 30; Colombia, 15.

We don't have enough time in the rest of the session of Congress to examine all of the multilateral organizations where the U.S. has obligations. Obviously, that is going to be an effort that should take place as we change administrations, whether it be the Vice President or whether it be the Governor from Texas. Today, like my colleague, I want to focus on NATO a bit and offer some possible suggestions for the future of America's alliances.

During the Cold War, containment of Soviet power provided a simple and easily definable job of deterrence from Warsaw Pact aggression. The new Strategic Concept that was adopted over a year ago during the 50th anniversary of

NATO is a far different concept from the collective defense organization originally developed from the ashes of World War II.

If you read the Strategic Concept, you will find that the new commitments outlined have evolved, as I have indicated, NATO from a collective security organization concerned with self-defense to an international crisis management and humanitarian relief operation and organization.

Alexander Vershbow, U.S. Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council, recently said:

Unbeknownst to many is the fact that the Strategic Concept's most important function is to instruct Alliance military authorities how to configure NATO defense forces so that they are equipped for the full range of Alliance missions, from collective defense to peacekeeping.

He also said:

The U.S. believes that the most important new elements of the revised Strategic Concept is the recognition that the fundamental tasks of the Alliance is to carry out so-called "non-article 5" missions—operations in response to crises that go beyond the defense of a Allied territory.

I am concerned that the most important and successful alliance in the history of our country has been so dramatically restructured that the future of the alliance is uncertain. Our force structure cannot stand another swampy intervention with unclear and unsound objectives with no exit strategy in sight.

The new Strategic Concept, as tested in Kosovo, in my personal opinion, is drying out the Cold War glue which holds the alliance together. Targeting by committee and escalation warfare has stressed the system and turned a 3-day war into a 78-day war of limited escalation. As indicated by the debate on this floor just about an hour or two ago, an amendment introduced by both Senator BYRD and Senator WARNER will cause considerable and useful debate on Monday and Tuesday ending in a critical vote about the future of the Kosovo operation.

Gen. Brent Scowcroft expressed his concern last November stating:

The revised Strategic Concept of NATO and the U.N. Secretary General separately have taken on the task of advocating the support of persecuted minorities inside state boundaries; that is, humanitarian operations such as those in Kosovo. In Yugoslavia, we heavily bombed a country in an attempt to protect a minority within that country. Now we are in Kosovo presiding over reverse ethnic cleansing—surely a case of unintended consequences.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, recently posed several thought-provoking questions:

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, what should be the limits of NATO's mission? With the Kosovo crisis, NATO fired its first shot in anger in a region outside the alliance's treaty area, on declared humanitarian grounds. What criteria might NATO draw on to guide a policy on the threat, or use, of its force in a new strategic environment of the 21st century?

Some experts predict, and I hope they are not right, that due to the ugliness of Kosovo, NATO may never again mount another military offensive. I fear that Kosovo or future Kosovo-type interventions will also undermine U.N. Security Council credibility. By the way, that credibility is being questioned with the U.N. mission in Africa.

Mr. President, if knowing what we know now about the new Strategic Concept and NATO with respect to a Kosovo or a Chechnya or Rwanda, would Senators still support the changes?

Again, I maintain that most Senators are not aware of all the obligations listed in the Strategic Concept. I said it at the time, I said it 6 months ago, I said it during the first dialog, and I say it again today. How many people need to be placed in jeopardy before we act? What criteria do we set for humanitarian or C-list interventions? Does the United States intervene with or without NATO allies or U.N. Security Council approval on humanitarian grounds? Can we possibly justify intervention in some areas of the world and not others when none reach the threshold of vital or important national interests?

Our country cannot support militarily a future which pursues U.S. and allied interests more widely around the world. The new Strategic Concept that our country is currently operating under effectively enrolls the United States and NATO as a world policeman.

Some say that is not all bad. Some say that is what we must do as the world's only superpower.

In this regard, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia pointed out, Europe is not standing still. They are proceeding with a Defense Capability Initiative and the development of the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within the alliance.

I believe it is in U.S. interests for the European alliance to develop their defense capabilities, to strengthen their collective will, and to make a greater contribution to security and defense in Europe. However, my Dodge City gut feeling says, sure, go ahead and provide for your own defense, and bring our American men and women home. The Balkans are in your ball park. You decide the players.

However, history and military experience, and the experience and expertise of others, rightly point out that challenges with force structure, allocation, balance, interoperability, and the growing gap in tactics and capability between our countries underlying the auspices of NATO are counterproductive to peace.

In Kosovo, the U.S. aircraft flew two-thirds of the strike missions. Nearly every precision-guided munition was launched from an American aircraft, and U.S. intelligence identified almost all the targets. With the current European shrinking defense budgets and a reluctance to support the current mission, the road to ESDI may be a rocky one filled with potholes indeed.

Even members of NATO who do not belong to the European Union are worried that plans for yet another new E.U. military force could weaken the collective defense.

Another concern of hierarchy and command structure with respect to ESDI, E.U. corps, and NATO still retaining the rights of first refusal and how the U.N. Security Council structure fits among the organizations is also a very troubling problem to overcome.

The number one concern should be to preserve NATO as the overarching framework and avoid duplication of effort or any political divisiveness from establishing separate capabilities. The Kosovo crisis raises questions that must be answered about the alliance's capability to reshape itself for new conflicts of the 21st century and at the same time accommodate the E.U.'s ambition to play a greater role in the continent's security.

Mr. President, I also want to address the issue of NATO expansion.

I realize the NATO membership is an affair of the heart for many nations who aspire to become members. However, as Senator LUGAR has alluded to we need to step back a little bit and keep the door open but put the future enlargement on hold.

We had a lunch hosted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Indiana and Gen. Wesley Clark. Gen. Clark emphasized the fact that nations in Europe who aspire to become either members of the European Union, Partnership for Peace, or NATO without recognizing the tremendous fervor and the tremendous emotion involved in regard to their self-determination and what they think will be the bulwark for them and their individual liberty.

First and foremost, NATO, I think, must rebuild Russian relations, which were strained over the Kosovo conflict. I know that belief is shared by Senator LEVIN. We have been working together on a cooperative threat reduction program within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee which we believe will make some meaningful threat reduction progress and at the same time help rebuild stressed relations.

The London Times diplomatic editor, Christopher Lockwood, reflects that NATO's possible new members at the current time cannot contribute militarily with force structure, compatible doctrine, or political and economic stability.

I have been a strong supporter of NATO. I will remain a strong supporter of NATO. But I think we have to rethink the current NATO flightpath and answer the hard questions that require our attention.

Mr. President, I now want to offer what I think are extremely insightful approaches to the future of multilateral organizations.

Richard Haass expressed:

Alliances, such as NATO, are one manifestation, although such groupings are rare

and likely to become even less common in a world of few fixed adversaries. Much more common are informal coalitions of parties able and willing to work together on behalf of a common purpose—be it to rescue the Mexican economy, contain Saddam Hussein, or enter East Timor. Such groupings are not ideal—they are invariably ad hoc and reactive and lack the legitimacy of more formal regional or UN undertakings—but they are consistent with a world where the willingness of governments to cooperate varies from crisis to crisis and situation to situation, where great power consensus is unreliable, and where U.S. resources, however great, are still limited.

Samuel Huntington, in this book "The Clash of Civilizations" explain: "In the emerging era, clashes of civilizations are the greatest threat to world peace, and an international order based on civilizations is the surest safeguard against war." And, since the Cold War the question of "Which side are you on?" has been replaced by the much more fundamental one, "Who are you?" Every state has to have an answer. That answer, its cultural identity, defines the state's place in world politics, its friends, and its enemies.

Mr. Huntington further explains that we must nurture other Western cultures that identify with the U.S. and accept our civilization as unique not universal and uniting to renew and preserve it against challenges from non-Western societies. Avoidance of a global war of civilizations depends on world leaders accepting and cooperating to maintain the multi civilizational character of global politics.

Roberts translation: Why not concentrate in areas of the world where Western values, Western democracy, have been cherished, nurtured, and appreciated? At the same time the U.S. needs to stop trying to impose Western values in areas where they are not and will not take root?

Andrew Krepinevich from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments recently finished a thought-provoking future vision titled "Transforming America's Alliances." He believes that America's alliances are in need of transformation due to the following reasons: Relative decline in U.S. global power, the rise and recovery of great regional power, with an increased focus on Asia, the eroding of current ally durability and reliability, the current military revolution will make power projection more difficult, and finally the growing need to provide for homeland defense.

Mr. President, I feel Mr. Krepinevich's assessment undertakes bold steps toward the future in his following statement:

If the U.S. is to preserve the current favorable military balance in regions around the globe in the future, it will find itself increasingly dependent upon allies for support. This may require a somewhat different set of alliances than exist today. Restructuring alliance relationships to meet requirements will take years, perhaps decades. Yet the geopolitical and military revolutions that will likely stress the U.S. alliance relationships should be undertaken now.

Mr. President, that is what we are trying to do. That is what Senator

CLELAND and I are trying to accomplish with our foreign policy dialog. America cannot afford to miss this opportunity to shape the future.

I thank my colleague for initiating the third dialog. I especially thank my colleagues who have been very patient listening to my remarks. Senator LUGAR, Senator LEVIN, and I welcome their input.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator from Indiana yield for 2 minutes?

Mr. LUGAR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent, after the Senator from Indiana is finished with his remarks, I be recognized to participate in the dialog which is going on between Senator ROBERTS and Senator CLELAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9½ minutes.

Mr. CLELAND. I yield the time necessary to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask the Presiding Officer how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators from Kansas and Georgia are sharing the time.

Mr. ROBERTS. So the time remaining in regard to both Senators is now 9 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. That does not give enough time for the distinguished Senator from Michigan or the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I ask unanimous consent we be granted an additional 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent, after the Senator from Indiana has completed his statement, I be recognized with whatever time is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from me along with one I received today from Gen. Wesley Clark, who, until last week, was NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and the senior military commander of the NATO-led operation at Kosovo. It relates to his views on the Byrd-Warner amendment, as it is called, which is part of the military construction appropriations bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
Washington, DC, May 10, 2000.

General WESLEY K. CLARK, USA,
Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL CLARK: Following up on our conversation today, I am enclosing a copy of

an amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee yesterday that, among other things, would terminate funding for deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President requests and Congress enacts a joint resolution specifically authorizing their continued deployment.

I would very much like to have your personal views on this amendment, particularly your views on the impact this amendment could have on U.S. troops currently on the ground in Kosovo and whether or not this amendment would increase the risk to those troops; the impact of this amendment on U.S. interests in the region; and the impact of this amendment on our relationship with our NATO allies.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN,
Ranking Minority Member.

MAY 11, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR LEVIN: Thank you for your letter of 10 May and the opportunity to provide my personal views on the amendment adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee governing the future of U.S. troops in Kosovo.

While I support efforts of the Congress and the Administration to encourage our allies to fulfill their commitments to the United Nations mission in Kosovo, I am opposed to the specific measures called for in the amendment. These measures, if adopted, would be seen as a de facto pull-out decision by the United States. They are unlikely to encourage European allies to do more. In fact, these measures would invalidate the policies, commitments and trust of our Allies in NATO, undercut US leadership worldwide, and encourage renewed ethnic tension, fighting and instability in the Balkans. Furthermore, they would, if enacted, invalidate the dedication and commitment of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines, disregarding the sacrifices they and their families have made to help bring peace to the Balkans.

Regional stability and peace in the Balkans are very important interests of the United States. Our allies are already providing over 85 percent of the military forces and the funding for reconstruction efforts. US leadership in Kosovo exercised through the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, as well as our diplomatic offices, is a bargain. It is an effective 6:1 ratio of diplomatic throw-weight to our investment. We cannot do significantly less. Our allies would see this as a unilateral, adverse move that splits fifty years of shared burdens, shared risks, and shared benefits in NATO.

This action will also undermine specific plans and commitments made within the Alliance. At the time that US military and diplomatic personnel are pressing other nations to fulfill and expand their commitment of forces, capabilities and resources, an apparent congressionally mandated pullout would undercut their leadership and all parallel diplomatic efforts.

All over Europe, nations are looking to the United States. We are their inspiration, their model, and their hope for the future. Small nations, weary of oppression, ravaged by a century of war, looking to the future, look to us. The promise of NATO enlargement, led by the United States, is the promise of the expansion of the sphere of peace and stability from Western Europe eastward. This powerful, stabilizing force would be undercut by this legislation, which would be perceived to significantly curtail US commitment and influence in Europe.

Setting a specific deadline for US pull-out would signal to the Albanians the limits of

the international security guarantees providing for their protection. This, in turn, would give them cause to rearm and prepare to protect themselves from what they would view as an inevitable Serbian reentry. The more radical elements of the Albanian population in Kosovo would be encouraged to increase the level of violence directed against the Serb minority, thereby increasing instability as well as placing US forces on the ground at increased risk. Mr. Milosevic, in anticipation of the pullout and ultimate breakup of KFOR, would likely encourage civil disturbances and authorize the increased infiltration of para-military forces to raise the level of violence. He would also take other actions aimed at preparing the way for Serbian military and police reoccupation of the province.

Our servicemen and women, and their families, have made great sacrifices in bringing peace and stability to the Balkans. This amendment introduces uncertainty in the planning and funding of the Kosovo mission. This uncertainty will be undermine our service members' confidence in our resolve and may call into question the sacrifices we have asked of them and their families. A US withdrawal could give Mr. Milosevic the victory he could not achieve on the battlefield.

In all of our activities in NATO, the appropriate distribution of burdens and risk remains a longstanding and legitimate issue among the nations. Increased European burden sharing is an imperative in Europe as well as the United States. European nations are endeavoring to meet this challenge in Kosovo, and in the whole KFOR and UNMIK constitute a burdensharing success story, even as we encourage Europeans to do even more. The United States must continue to act in our own best interests. This legislation, if enacted, would see its worthy intent generating consequences adverse to some of our most fundamental security interests.

Thank you again for your support of our servicemen and women.

Very respectfully,

WESLEY K. CLARK,
General, U.S. Army.

Mr. LEVIN. I will take 30 seconds to read two paragraphs about the language in the letter from Wesley Clark:

These measures, if adopted, would be seen as a de facto pull-out decision by the United States. They are unlikely to encourage European allies to do more. In fact, these measures would invalidate the policies, commitments and trust of our Allies in NATO, undercut U.S. leadership worldwide, and encourage renewed ethnic tension, fighting and instability in the Balkans. Furthermore, they would, if enacted, invalidate the dedication and commitment of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines, disregarding the sacrifices they and their families have made to help bring peace to the Balkans.

Setting a specific deadline for U.S. pull-out would signal to the Albanians the limits of the international security guarantees providing for their protection. This, in turn, would give them cause to rearm and prepare to protect themselves from what they would view as an inevitable Serbian reentry. The more radical elements of the Albanian population in Kosovo would be encouraged to increase the level of violence directed against the Serb minority, thereby increasing instability as well as placing U.S. forces on the ground at increased risk.

Mr. Milosevic, in anticipation of the pullout and ultimate breakup of KFOR, would likely encourage civil disturbances and authorize the increased infiltration of para-military forces to raise the level of violence. He would also

take other actions aimed at preparing the way for Serbian military police reoccupation of the province.

I know this subject will be a matter of some debate on Monday and Tuesday. I intend to participate in that debate on the appropriations bill containing the Byrd-Warner provision. But at this time, because of the interest in the letter of General Clark, I thought I would ask that be printed in the RECORD.

Again, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators from Georgia and Kansas. It is a privilege to follow on some of the thoughts of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, as he has discussed multilateral organizations and focused especially on NATO which, in the judgment of many of us, is the most important and successful of these organizations in which the United States is a member.

It is axiomatic, at least for many in foreign policy, that Europe counts for the United States. By that I mean simply this: that although throughout our history many have argued that we could get along by ourselves on this continent and that entanglement in the affairs of Europe was often described as nefarious skullduggery statesmanship without scruple, that eventually we come back to the fact that in the small world in which we live now, what happens on that continent matters a great deal to our security and to our prosperity.

It is for this reason that the United States stayed in Europe after World War II. To state it very simply, as German Foreign Minister Fischer stated when he visited with our Foreign Relations Committee this week: The United States presence, the decision to stay, made all the difference in the last half century. It made a difference in terms of peace on the Europe continent, which had not had such an era of peace in a whole millennium.

It made a very great difference for us, the United States, leaving aside NATO and the security it provided, because of the collective defense of NATO members against the perceived menace of the former Soviet Union and its allies. The fact is that through the Marshall Plan, and through many other economic associations, the European countries grew substantially and so did our markets and so did our prosperity. We tend to take this all for granted, but only in the last 50 years has this been a fact.

We came to a point after the breakup of the former Soviet Union in which many argued, and I was not the one who originated the term, but I adopted it in a tour I took of Europe in 1993, that either NATO would go "out of area or out of business." By that I meant simply that the idea of collective defense against the former Soviet Union, which had broken up, made

much less sense than it had made before. Some would have said the Soviet Union might revive suddenly and attack hapless European nations, but this became less and less likely. In fact, we found in the Desert Storm war, that our problem was that NATO was not equipped to deal with conflicts out of area. It was a pickup game in which we enlisted various nations.

This out of area action had been contemplated at the time of the United Nations Charter in Article 4, which Senator ROBERTS has cited. John Foster Dulles spoke openly and eloquently on that point. It was anticipated that NATO members from time to time would act out of area in their collective efforts and for collective security. So we did that in Desert Storm and the idea was always, from the time of the United Nations Charter and the NATO Charter onward, that nations could freely decide to join in such actions. In the case of Desert Storm they did so.

Now that a whole new set of facts began to come forward, in which there were countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and others—but mainly the first three—in which the point was made: We are a democracy. We are searching for freedom. We are searching for relevance and association with others who want freedom as we do.

Some argued the evolution of Europe might have come entirely through the European Union, through the economic union of the members. But most of us noted that was going very slowly. It still goes slowly. Poland is not a member of the European Union as we speak, and it is not contemplated that it will be for several years. This is now a very large country with a functioning economy and a democracy.

The point was that collective security meant making certain that the gains, the victories of the cold war, were ensured and were solidified. That was the debate that we had a short time ago with regard to expansion of NATO. Some argued: Why expand if there is no particular threat? Why not wait and see how the threat shapes up? You can always take on new members in the event things are troubled.

But many argued, and I was one, that the integration of forces, the building of institutions, takes time. Even in the successful war we fought in the desert, the weapons systems that were employed took 25 years to evolve. It is very probable that the strengths we are now building with new members in Europe, in NATO, will make a difference in terms of their collective security, and I believe in ours. With the crisis over, many persons in the United States and maybe in this body, tend to ask: Why are we involved in Europe? In fact, why can't Europeans run their own affairs? They say it is a troublesome situation to have our forces involved there, meddling and in harm's way.

We went through this in a very practical way with regard to the war in Bosnia. As you may recall, in the latter stages of the Bush administration,

there was anxiety on the part of President Bush as to what was happening in the former Yugoslavia. He was strongly advised by European leaders that they knew better what was happening there, that our involvement was really not particularly welcomed. President Bush may have welcomed that advice, for all I know. But in any event, his determination was to leave that problem alone, so the conflict continued to progress badly in terms of the loss of life and displacement of persons and refugees and so forth.

President Clinton attacked former President Bush in the 1992 campaign for failing to have a plan for Bosnia. But when President Clinton came into office in 1993 he found out how difficult that situation was.

I know from my own experience, traveling with Senator Nunn in 1993, talking on the phone with President Clinton over long distance as he asked what we were finding out and how things were going? He was attempting to evolve a policy.

He sent Secretary Christopher to Europe about that time, a trip which was very unsuccessful. The Secretary talked with the British and then the French and gave our views and asked their views. They had all sorts of views, all of them contradictory, and none of them helpful with regard to anything we had in mind.

As a result, things drifted. Some may say that was simply too bad. Here are people with intractable views, demagogues. Whatever was happening in Yugoslavia was miserable and unfortunate for those people, and especially for their neighbors, our European allies. But that was their problem—and perhaps it was. But late in the game, Europeans came to us and said: We cannot solve it. It is insoluble without the United States.

We might have said, "Tough luck. You are on your own. This is what you wanted. You made your bed, now sleep in it."

We could have said that. We could have watched the unraveling of various parts of Europe as refugees and economic difficulties and aggression proceeded. But we took a different view—I think the correct view—namely, we are the leaders in NATO. NATO was relevant to that situation.

That was a big step but not all Senators agreed. The point being made in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished Senator from Virginia is that we have not gone to war very often. We have declared war even less. It is time to stop these informal arrangements in which we get involved in operations without having an up-or-down vote or authorization to spend money or send the troops.

That is a good point. I can remember arguing before the Desert Storm war that we ought to do that, and there was great anxiety in the White House about any such vote for fear it might come out badly that Saddam Hussein, there-

fore, would have a free ride. Ultimately, the vote was very close.

I understand the constitutional point very well. It could very well be that historians will argue we misplayed our hand at Rambouillet, that our diplomacy was not as swift as it should have been, that we made threats when we did not understand the military power that would be necessary to make those threats good, and that even having made the threats, we did not have a very good plan once we were tested. I make no apologies for any of what proceeded, but the point is, we finally come back to the fact we are in Europe because it is our security—our security—that is at stake. It could be argued, too, that for the moment the Europeans are not sharing the burden, although they would argue, by this time, that they are shouldering their burden—but that is another debate all by itself. Or they might argue we should not be involved without having up-or-down votes in the Congress on these things in any event, or that many Americans believe we are in Kosovo or in Bosnia purely for humanitarian purposes, not for gut strategic purposes of the United States, but because of ethnic cleansing or refugees or displaced persons.

The case will be made that this is not a real war, this is a policing action; it is a structural problem, like that faced by a mayor of a city or police or other situations analogous that can be handled by police, and European policemen rather than American policemen.

We keep coming back to this haunting question that President George Bush had to face and then President Bill Clinton when the Europeans said: We cannot make it by ourselves. Ultimately, Europeans might say: We can; we are different now; we have new institutions—whether they be security or economic—and you Americans can go home; we can get along without you; it's been nice to have you around.

That is not what they are saying. As a matter of fact, every European statesman who comes to Washington—and the Chair presides over these coffees in our Foreign Relations Committee—we hear every single foreign minister and defense minister vowing how important it is the United States is there, stays there, stays there big, how we must take the lead and help organize the situation. We may say in our impatience: Will they never be able to pull it together? Perhaps not in our lifetime.

What are the consequences if we leave? The consequence is the same one the German foreign minister told us this week. We left after the First World War. As a matter of fact, throughout the 1930s, we were not only isolationists, we were glad we were not close to the action, and we suffered for that. We lost a lot of lives. We had a war around the world that was tough and go for some time because we were not prepared to do the difficult work, the tedious work, the actual intervention day

by day, the grimy, grubby work of diplomacy country by country, case by case. That is the problem.

Duty in Kosovo, duty in Bosnia is not a popular assignment for anybody and never will be. I can think of various other places in Europe in which it is not going to be very pleasant. Yet to keep the peace for over 50 years, to have prosperity for them and for us, to make a difference in terms of stability of the world, that counts for something.

On the cheap, we can say, by and large, we did not vote for it, we are tired of paying too much for it. Europeans understand that a little bit, and I give credit to the distinguished Senator from Virginia for trying to urge them to step up to the plate, and they have now demonstrated they are paying more than 85 percent—the lion's share—whether it is the policing side or the economic side, and that we are paying 15 percent, and that is about what we agreed to do.

They said, in essence: You fought most of the war, we will pick up five-sixths of the cost. That may or may not be a good agreement, but that is roughly where we have come to in Kosovo. We could say we are tired of paying the 15 percent and, as a matter of fact, our 5,000 or 6,000 troops are tired of being there and, as a Senate, we are tired of debating the issue. We would just like to get a vote on this and get rid of it cleanly. Tell the President, whoever he is, where to go in this situation. It makes no difference whether we have a Secretary of State negotiating over there or not, we know better because we represent the people and we have the power of the purse and we can jerk this thing out immediately.

Some will argue whether or not to do that as a matter of fact. The vote would not come for a year. General Clark has testified to this in the letter the distinguished Senator from Michigan just read, that other countries will make their own calculations. We, frankly, do not know what the foreign policy of President Putin of Russia will be. We suspect, as a matter of fact, as we have heard from the Russian Ambassador and from others that the Russians want a zone in Kosovo, maybe ours. Let's say we withdraw and the Russians say: It would be fine, as a matter of fact, if we were there because we could help integrate the Serbs as they want to come back to their homes, or help with a little bridge there; that would be a good thing in terms of integration of Europe as we see it; and we are here as Russians; the Americans have gone home; they were tired of this, tired of the policing action and all the burdens, all the difficulties. That is one possibility.

President Milosevic might say: Let's be at ease for a year, wait it out. Kosovo was sort of a contretemps, a bad nightmare. A good many bombs were dropped around the country, there was some difficulties with the power stations and difficulties in terms of

deprivation, but, by and large, that is in the past, and in a year's time, we can be home free. We can begin to operate business as usual.

The Albanians noting the situation likewise say: We have a year to prepare for the war to take on the Serbs who are back with perhaps the help of Russian friends and others who come in to fill this vacuum.

European allies will be accused frequently of withdrawing people from the country. They will say, by and large, the Americans are a strange leader; they are gone. This is the only war NATO ever fought and some may feel the only one it ever will fight because there was not very much leadership here, not much standing to talk to us about whether we have an independent force, whether it is with NATO or anybody else.

We have a very fateful vote coming up, and it comes right to the point we are discussing today: multinational organizations and particularly NATO, the most important security alliance, because Europe counts.

I suggest we do reaffirm NATO.

As a matter of fact, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas pointed out, I suggested last year at the NATO celebration that we consider carefully new members. There were nine applicants. I say it is imperative that we keep hope alive for all nine. That is the incentive for their reform and for the courage to continue on.

As a matter of fact, I hope we will move to adopt new members. I hope we will offer leadership to fill out much more substantially those who have fought for freedom, those who have a lot at stake in the kind of Europe we think would be more secure for them and for us.

I think we ought to be devoting more resources to NATO rather than less. It seems to me we have a golden opportunity. Historically, we have been established there for a long time. To abandon or weaken NATO at this point, or to give hints we are going to abandon it, or to give hints that it can be taken for granted, would be an unfortunate policy.

By the same token, this debate gives us an opportunity to finally establish, once and for all the question: Does Europe count? Do we care? Can Europe make it without us? I believe it counts. I do not think they can make it without us. I think we have to be there. And if we are going to be there, we ought to lead, and we ought to have the resources that make it count. We ought to expand the operation, as a matter of fact. We ought to be assertive and bold as opposed to timidly pulling back into our tent.

I believe that is what the debate ought to be about. It ought to be about the strength of the very best multinational organization we have, about the reasons our allies are important to us, and what we intend to do about it.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to give this address.

I thank the distinguished Senators from Georgia and Kansas, again, for inviting me to be a part of the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLELAND. How much time is left on our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks with some additional thoughts and comments.

I thank Senator LUGAR, a distinguished student and practitioner of foreign policy in this body for many years, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, and thank him for his wonderful letter from General Clark, who is a man with whom I have shared a meal recently and discussed Kosovo and many other matters. He is a distinguished American. I respect him highly.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas. One of the things that impressed me was the point the Senator from Kansas mentioned, that this country is committed and obligated in some form or fashion to 90 different treaties or organizations, and that is indeed quite an astounding number.

I have two basic fears about America's global role. One is that, like Gulliver, we will get wrapped up in many lilliputian events and treaties and entanglements and not be free to move to crises in the world where we need to have a maximum impact; secondly, that we get drawn into power vacuums around the world, particularly in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union, and institute a pax Americana.

I was recently in Macedonia. As the helicopter took off, headed toward Kosovo, an Army colonel pointed out that if you looked out of the helicopter to your left, you could see a Roman aqueduct. I had never really been in that part of the world. It was amazing to actually see a Roman aqueduct put together by the Roman armies there in Macedonia over 2,000 years ago and it still be intact.

I began to think the very ground over which I was flying had been occupied by not only Alexander the Great but his father Philip, and that Greek and Roman armies had gone over this very terrain. Later, after the Dark Ages, for some 600 years the Turks and the Ottoman Empire occupied this particular land. Now we, the Americans, were there.

It was a sobering moment for me. I wondered exactly how effective we could really be in that part of the world with those conflicts which seem to be eternal. I wondered exactly what we could do there, what we could contribute, especially with our military force.

Those are some thoughts I have.

I would like to address one other issue in terms of our multilateral and multinational relations, and that is our relationship with the United Nations.

In large part because of American support, the UN was founded in 1945 with the purpose, according to its Charter:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Furthermore, under Article 34 of the U.N. Charter, U.N. "members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf." And Article 52 provides that:

Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

In recent years, the United States has worked with, and sometimes without, the cooperation of the U.N. Security Council when seeking to accomplish its objectives. Despite all the difficulties associated with it, the Security Council remains the only widely accepted, multinational, legitimizing force for conducting military operations against a sovereign nation. In the 1995 book, "Beyond Westphalia," editors Gene Lyons, Michael Mustanduno and their colleagues tackled the difficult question of "state sovereignty and international intervention." The authors write that:

A historical transition was marked by the settlement of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War and opened the quest—which goes on to this day—to find a way for independent states, each enjoying sovereignty over a given territory, to pursue their interests without destroying each other or the international system of which each is a part.

One of the recurring themes which has been highlighted in these floor dialogues organized by Senator ROBERTS and myself about the global role of the United States in the post-Cold War world is on this very question of sovereignty. More specifically, under what conditions is it permissible and appropriate for a nation or coalition of nations to intervene in the internal affairs of another sovereign state?

In an April 1999 speech in Chicago, British Prime Minister Blair posed the question in a way which is representative of the concerns of many of those—especially in the Western democracies—who believe that, under certain egregious circumstances, there must be limits on national sovereignty in today's world. Prime Minister Blair said:

The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in

which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. And it is not one we would want to jettison too readily. One state should not feel it has the right to change the political system of another or foment subversion or seize pieces of territory to which it feels it should have some claim. But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects. Acts of genocide can never be a purely internal matter. When oppression produces massive flows of refugees which unsettle neighboring countries then they can properly be described as "threats to international peace and security."

It is interesting that on that same day in 1999, Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso offered some related observations, with his views on the Kosovo War, which he and his country supported. President Cardoso's views reflect the concerns of many of those in the developing world who worry about the consequences of a loss of sovereignty in reducing their ability to control their own destiny.

We heard Senator ROBERTS talk about the fear of the United States and its growing hegemony or being a great hegemony in various portions of the world, or being the "big dog."

President Cardoso said this:

Who has the authority and approval of the international community to drop bombs? Such attacks are not endorsed by an international organization that legalized such actions. The United Nations was left aside . . . The United States currently constitutes the only large center of political, economic, technologic, and even cultural power. This country has everything to exert its domain on the rest of the world, but it must share it. There must be rules, even for the stronger ones. When the strongest one makes decisions without listening, everything becomes a bit more difficult. In this European war, NATO made the decision, but who legalized it? That is the main problem. I am convinced more than ever that we need a new political order in the world.

How do we reconcile these different and sometimes conflicting, yet both legitimate, concerns: the need on the one hand to protect powerless individuals from the depredations of their own governments, and on the other to protect less powerful nations from unilateral or even multilateral decisions by the stronger powers?

Mr. President, in the last dialog, I tried to quote President Kennedy. I think I got the quote wrong. I think he said that "we must dream of a world in which the strong are just, the weak secure, and the peace preserved." I think that is what President Cardoso was after.

The editors of *Beyond Westphalia* draw four principal conclusions which bear on this matter. The first two offer encouragement to those who see a clear need for constraints on unfettered sovereignty, especially in cases of massive human rights violations:

First, constraints on state sovereignty not only have a long history but have been increasing significantly in recent years as a consequence of both growing interdependence and the end of the cold war . . . (Second), while constraints on state

sovereignty traditionally were largely constraints on states' behavior with regard to other states, in recent decades constraints on sovereignty have increasingly involved the internal affairs of states, or how governments relate to their own citizens, economies, and territories.

However, the current limits on international interventions are captured in the final two observations:

(Third), the international community has developed a formidable institutional presence, yet clearly lacks the resources and organizational capacity to serve as a viable alternative to the society of sovereign states . . . (Fourth), the legitimacy of the international community will continue to be questionable as long as there are fundamental differences between North and South with regard to whose values and interests the international community represents . . . If the major powers claim to be acting, through the exercise of their international decisionmaking authority, as the guardians of the common good, less powerful states seem to want to know, who is guarding the guardians?

Lyons and Mastanduno conclude that we are likely to experience an ongoing "chipping away" at the sovereign autonomy of nations. However, they end with the following cautionary note:

The idea of state sovereignty is alive and well among both the more powerful and less powerful members of contemporary international society. Even if states increasingly share authority with intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, the state system endures.

So where does that leave us? For the isolationists and the unilateralists, the question of international intervention is, of course, not important for they believe that the United States should not, or need not, rely on other nations or the international community in advancing our security interests. However, as I have said in the first two of these dialogues, I do not believe the people of our country are prepared now, or in the foreseeable future, to pay the substantial—albeit quite different—costs arising out of either the isolationists' or the unilateralists' agendas.

For everyone else, including balance of power realists, Wilsonian idealists and everyone in between, they have to face the dilemma of balancing the reality of the continuing dominance of the nation state as the key player in international security affairs with the increasing transnational communications, economic forces, and values which are circumscribing national sovereignty.

In my opinion, we have no choice but to try to improve the international machinery for legitimating and, in some circumstances conducting, interventions in extreme cases where a nation's actions within its own borders necessitate such a response. To do otherwise would be to ignore the trends noted by Lyons and Mastanduno in 1995 and which have certainly considered apace since then. And whatever its shortcomings, and they are many, it is clear that the international machinery of choice, for the United States as well

as for most of the world, and recognized in solemn commitments—for example including NATO's own charter—is the United Nations and more particularly its Security Council.

But it is equally clear that the UN's machinery is not now capable of fulfilling this role assigned to it by the international community. The sad current events in Sierra Leone, and previously in Bosnia, in Rwanda, in Angola, and in Somalia demonstrate convincingly that the UN cannot enforce the will of the international community unless all local parties accept its intervention. In other words, it can enforce an existing peace but cannot make peace.

And in the absence of an effective United Nations, I say to the advocates of humanitarian intervention, we have to proceed with great caution. Furthermore, while various Western leaders and theorists have proposed standards to determine when and how national sovereignty should be overridden, such standards are neither comprehensive, nor clear, nor widely accepted.

Though I do not oppose the notion of international intervention in principle—because as I said before various global trends are moving us in that direction—in my opinion much will have to be done before we can or should stake important national interests on it. Among the steps which must be undertaken are:

Reforming the peacekeeping operations and decision-making processes within the UN and the Security Council.

Strengthening the capabilities of regional organizations, like the Organization for African Unity, the Organization of American States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—and as I suggested earlier the European Union—to deal with regional threats to international order.

Thoroughly debating—including in this body—the proposed frameworks for intervention put forward by the Clinton Administration, the British government, and others.

None of these steps will be easy. For example, reforming the decision-making processes of the Security Council in a way that improves its ability to act would presumably involve curtailing the veto power of the permanent members. However, while such a change would eliminate or reduce the ability of China or Russia to block what we view as appropriate interventions, it would also similarly constrain our own capacity to prevent what we view as undesirable actions by the UN. Strengthening the capabilities of regional entities raises resource questions, and, as already discussed, developing a serious European defense capability raises a number of additional concerns. And developing any sort of meaningful consensus about the principles for international interventions even among NATO members—let alone among both developed and developing countries—will be an extremely long

and difficult process. But for anyone who can conceive of circumstances where an international response will be in our national interest, it is the type of effort we will have to undertake.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks in this, our third session on the US Global Role. Our next discussion will hopefully take place during the week of May 22, and in many ways is at the heart of the concerns which motivated both me and Senator ROBERTS to initiate these dialogs: the central question of when and how to employ American military forces abroad. I look forward to that debate—which will appropriately occur just before the Memorial Day break—and I hope other Senators will participate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Is there any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator CLELAND and Senator ROBERTS for instituting this bipartisan dialogue relating to the global role of the United States. We normally only discuss these issues when a real-world contingency is looming and we do so under significant time constraints and within the dynamic of rapidly unfolding crises. This dialogue, which allows us to discuss these issues in a better setting, will hopefully contribute in a better understanding of the various perspectives on these issues and may bring us closer to a consensus on the fundamental issue of the global role of the United States.

This week's subject—"Multilateral Organizations"—is a very broad area. I will confine my remarks to those multilateral organizations that have responsibilities relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. I have in mind organizations like the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the mutual defense treaties to which the United States is a party.

I would like to briefly discuss several recent international crises and the role that the various multilateral organizations played in addressing those crises. I want to note, at the outset, that sometimes they were successful and sometimes they failed.

Mr. President, I don't know how many of my colleagues have ever been to Dubrovnik. It is an ancient and breathtakingly beautiful seaside city on Croatia's Dalmatian coast. When the Yugoslav Army subjected Dubrovnik to indiscriminate shelling in October 1991, resulting in the systematic destruction in the old city and

the loss of many civilian lives, the European Union or the Western European Union should have used force to end this barbarity in their own backyard. If they had, the ensuing damage and loss of life throughout the Balkans might have been avoided. Instead of acting with force, however, the European Union declined to take any forceful action. For its part, the UN Security Council imposed an international embargo on the supply of arms to the combatants, thus succeeding in locking in the advantage that the Yugoslav Army enjoyed. It doesn't appear that NATO even considered taking action at that stage of the Balkan conflict. This was an example of the inability or unwillingness of the United Nations, the European Union, NATO and other multilateral organizations to effectively deal with a real-world crisis that had the potential of spreading.

It should be noted that NATO has substantial forces under its command but the United Nations does not have a standing UN army, nor, in my view, should it. The United Nations is dependent upon the political will of its members to supply the forces and the financial resources to take action. It is ironic that politicians of all nations feel free to criticize the United Nations for failing to successfully carry out its missions but the reality is that any failure of the United Nations is a failure of the UN member nations to provide the UN with the necessary means for its missions. We can't have it both ways—we can't refuse to provide the UN with the necessary means to do its job and then hammer the UN for its failings.

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, in commenting upon a December 1999 Report of an Independent Inquiry that he commissioned and that documented the UN failure to prevent genocide in Rwanda and on his own earlier report on the UN's failure to safeguard Srebrenica, stated that "Of all my aims as Secretary General, there is none to which I feel more deeply committed than that of enabling the United Nations never again to fail in protecting a civilian population from genocide or mass slaughter."

Mr. President, I welcome Secretary General Kofi Annan's statement, but I recognize the reality that the UN's ability to take effective action in the future—even to prevent genocide—remains dependent upon the political will of UN member nations to provide the UN with the forces and the financial resources it needs.

Mr. President, just as the United Nations has learned some hard lessons in places like Rwanda and Srebrenica, so the United States learned a hard lesson in Somalia, where we lost 18 of our finest soldiers in a single engagement.

In response to the need for an effective peacekeeping capability in Africa, the United States, Britain and France are embarked on parallel and coordinated programs to enhance the capabilities of African countries to carry

out humanitarian and peacekeeping operations in Africa. The United States program, called the African Crisis Response Initiative or ACRI, has trained over 6,000 peacekeepers from the African nations of Benin, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Uganda, and Senegal. The ACRI program, whose program of instruction has been approved by the UN Department of Peacekeeping, also promotes professional apolitical militaries and reinforces respect for human rights and the proper role of a military in a democracy.

Mr. President, while most people only associate the UN with peacekeeping or peace enforcement missions, there are other actions that it has undertaken. In December 1992, the UN Security Council, at the request of the Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, established a preventive deployment mission in Macedonia in an effort to prevent the Balkan conflict from spreading into that nation. Originally composed of a Nordic battalion, it was augmented by a U.S. Army contingent in July 1993. The conflict did not spread to Macedonia, perhaps because of this mission. It was the first deployment of an international force prior to an initiation of hostilities.

The crisis in Kosovo also produced unprecedented actions by several multilateral organizations. In 1998, amidst mounting repression of the ethnic Albanian population by the Yugoslav Army and special police, Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic reached an agreement with U.S. envoy Dick Holbrooke to comply with UN demands for a cease-fire and to accept an intrusive verification regime of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Involving approximately 2,000 unarmed personnel, this was the largest, most complex and potentially most dangerous mission ever undertaken by the OSCE. Additionally, NATO deployed an Extraction Force to neighboring Macedonia that was poised to come to the assistance of the OSCE personnel if they came under attack. While the OSCE mission was not able to prevent all armed attacks, particularly the mass killing of ethnic Albanians in Racak in January 1999, it did enable international humanitarian relief organizations to provide directly needed assistance to the Kosovar population until forced to withdraw on March 20, 1999 in the face of an untenable situation, including additional large-scale deployments of Milosevic's military, special police and paramilitary forces into Kosovo.

By the time of the OSCE's withdrawal from Kosovo, repression of the ethnic-Albanian population of Kosovo escalated to a full-scale attempt to ethnically cleanse Kosovo. Unfortunately, the UN Security Council was unable to act as both Russia and China signaled that they would veto any resolution authorizing the use of force against the security forces of Slobodan

Milosevic. Despite the lack of international legitimation that a UN Security Council authorization would have provided, NATO was resolute and launched a 78-day air campaign that forced Slobodan Milosevic to accede to NATO's demands. This was the first time in its fifty-year history that NATO had embarked on a large-scale combat operation. Following the air campaign, the UN Security Council established a UN mission to administer Kosovo and authorized an international armed force under NATO leadership to provide a secure environment. And for the first time in the 20th Century, ethnic cleansing in Europe was reversed. The United States bore the major burden in NATO's air campaign but the European Union pledged to bear the major share of the reconstruction effort and has provided most of the peacekeeping forces for Kosovo. I welcome the fact that the United States is playing a junior role in the peacekeeping effort with only about 15 percent of the troops, and I also welcome our European NATO allies' expressed determination to play a more substantial role in future conflicts in Europe, either as part of a NATO or a European Union-led effort.

Additionally, in a departure from the normal UN practice, the UN Mission in Kosovo or UNMIK has been organized into four pillars, under the overall supervision of the UNMIK head, Dr. Kouchner. Those four pillars are: civil administration under the United Nations itself; humanitarian assistance, led by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees; democratization and institution-building, led by the OSCE; and economic reconstruction, managed by the EU.

Despite the fact that our NATO allies would have borne the effects of a massive flow of ethnic-Albanian Kosovars, regional instability, and the potential involvement of two of its member nations—Greece and Turkey—on opposite sides of the conflict, no individual European nation had the military or political wherewithal to use force against Serbia to end its barbarous acts. I doubt that a coalition of European nations could have done so. Although the United States had the military capability to carry out such an operation, as Secretary Cohen and General Shelton noted in their joint statement to the Armed Services Committee, "Operation Allied Force could not have been conducted without the NATO Alliance and without the infrastructure, transit and basing access, host-nation force contributions, and most importantly, political and diplomatic support provided by the allies and other members of the coalition."

Mr. President, much has been said and written about NATO's use of less than overwhelming, decisive force in the air campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. NATO's capability was limited to what I call "maximum achievable force," i.e., the maximum force that is politically achiev-

able and sustainable. As General Wesley Clark, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander during the air campaign, testified in response to my use of the concept "maximum achievable force".

"We knew we had to avoid collateral damage, keep the allies together, do the most we could against the targets on the ground, and avoid the loss of air crews. We had to keep it in balance. It was, as you put it, a maximum achievable force strategy."

An Alliance goes to war differently than an individual nation does. The United States clearly would have carried out the air campaign more robustly from the outset if we had been acting unilaterally.

Overwhelming, decisive force undoubtedly is the first and most preferred option for the United States in any military operation. That is the lesson of Vietnam. But if it is not possible, as it will rarely be when a coalition is considering action, then the next option is to use the maximum achievable force in an alliance setting. The question then becomes whether the greater risks entailed in using less than overwhelming, decisive force are worth taking.

If the participation of the whole NATO Alliance was both critical to the success of the military operation against Milosevic and the only politically achievable option, were we wise to proceed? If so, does this mean that we should automatically resign ourselves to using less than overwhelming, decisive force in any future conflict?

The answer is we should not resign ourselves to the use of less than overwhelming divisive force. But there will be times when because we can achieve an alliance action with maximum achievable force that it will be worth the risk, and there will be times when it will not.

An overwhelming, decisive force strategy is best when U.S. forces are involved in hostilities. In the case of Kosovo, our NATO allies were unwilling to adopt such a strategy. Our remaining options were to do nothing, to go it alone, or to use a maximum achievable force strategy, which meant a phased air campaign and no ground forces.

In my view, while there were drawbacks to going to war in Kosovo as part of a coalition, the benefits of fighting as part of the NATO coalition, under all the circumstances, outweighed those drawbacks. Napoleon said it well: "The only thing worse than fighting in a coalition is fighting against one."

If the use of overwhelming, decisive force is also not an option in some future conflict, we will once again have to make the judgment whether the risk involved in utilizing maximum achievable force, i.e. less than overwhelming, decisive force, outweighs the risk to U.S. interests of not proceeding.

Meanwhile across the globe in East Timor, the international community reacted in horror at the death and destruction wrought by pro-Indonesian

militias in the aftermath of a referendum that overwhelmingly favored independence from Indonesia. The UN Security Council authorized a multinational force to restore peace and security in East Timor. Australia took the lead in this peace enforcement mission and the United States provided support but did not provide any ground combat forces. As Admiral Blair, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Command, put it in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, "East Timor demonstrated the value of having the U.S. in a supporting role to a competent ally, providing unique and significant capabilities needed to ensure success without stretching the capability of U.S. forces and resources to conduct other operations worldwide."

Mr. President, the United States cannot be the world's policeman. But we also cannot withdraw to fortress America and seek to ignore what goes on in the rest of the world. The United States possesses unparalleled economic and military strength. But no nation—no matter how strong—can go it alone. Understanding this, our forebears formed alliances many years ago throughout the globe. Our collective defense treaties with the other 18 nations of the NATO Alliance and with countries like Australia, Japan, the Philippines, and the Republic of Korea are major contributors to the protection of our national security interests. Our status as one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, with veto power, also enables us to ensure that the actions of the Security Council are consistent with our national security interests. Our Alliances and our participation in the United Nations and other multilateral organizations also help to ensure that there is a shared responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The UN's authorization and approval of a mission adds great universal political support to the undertaking.

None of these organizations I have described are perfect and none of them will succeed in maintaining the peace if their Member nations lack the political will to provide the military forces, the financial resources, and, increasingly, the police forces to carry out the missions that are undertaken.

Mr. President, I realize that Senators CLELAND, ROBERTS and others talked about the security interests of the United States in a prior week. I don't plan to comment at length on that subject today, but I do believe that it is necessary to touch on it with respect to multilateral organizations.

The obvious point is that the extent to which the United States participates with its armed forces in a particular mission will be determined by the extent to which our national interests are involved and the degree of risk it entails, including, as noted above, the greater risks that may result from acting within a coalition.

Accordingly, the United States has made clear that it will not provide

troops for the United Nations peace-keeping mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the same vein, the United States will not provide troops for the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor, the follow-on mission to the Australian-led intervention force, but will provide a few U.S. officers to serve as observers and will, as part of their normal exercises, periodically deploy U.S. personnel to perform activities such as the rebuilding of schools and the restoration of medical services.

Mr. President, I believe that it is in the United States national interest to support the United Nations as it seeks to fulfill its primary responsibility to maintain international peace and stability. We also need to work to strengthen our alliances and to encourage our allies to strengthen their military capabilities so that they can share the common burden. We also need to utilize the various other multilateral organizations that can contribute to international peace and stability. Finally, we need to explore every opportunity to bring about actions that will serve to end conflict at the earliest possible time, as wasn't done in 1991 at the time of the initial shelling of Dubrovnik, and to prevent the spread of conflict, as was done by the UN preventive deployment mission to Macedonia in 1992.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to end in the same way that I started; namely, by commending Senator CLELAND and Senator ROBERTS for instituting this dialogue. I look forward to the continuation of this dialogue in the coming weeks and I hope to be able to participate again in the future.

I again thank our good friends from Georgia and Kansas. I add my thanks also to the Senator from Indiana for his extraordinarily thoughtful remarks this afternoon. I was not able to hear all of it. I would like to have heard all of it. But I heard enough to know that, as usual, the Senator from Indiana adds an extremely thoughtful and thorough contribution to this debate.

I commend our good friends from Georgia and Kansas for carrying on what I consider to be a very significant dialog. It takes a lot of effort and a lot of energy to do what they are doing. It is critical to this nation's security. Both of them have already made huge contributions to our Nation's security. Now, on the floor of the Senate, they are making an additional major contribution, and this country is again in their debt.

I thank my friends.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are about to go out. Before we do, I wanted to call attention to the fact that I wish we could have taken up the ESEA bill again this afternoon. The fact is that we have amendments that could have been offered on either side. We have indicated a willingness to even offer time agreements on virtually all amendments. There are a number of amendments that are pending. We are told that we just do not have time on the schedule to revisit ESEA this week. I really question that. The fact is that we have been in morning business all afternoon. We are not going to be in session tomorrow. We will be in debate only scheduled on Monday for the military construction bill. We are not overworked here.

It seems to me that on an issue as important as ESEA needs to be addressed. The fact is, it should have been reauthorized last year. It wasn't. It needs to be reauthorized this year.

We have fewer than 40 legislative days left between now and the time that we are scheduled to adjourn. With appropriations bills, the China debate, and a number of other issues unfinished—bankruptcy we hope, and other issues—there is very little time.

So it seems to me that we ought to be using what time we have available to us to our best advantage. Being in morning business for most of the day is not my concept of utilization of time in an appropriate way.

Again, I express the regret that we haven't had more of a chance this week to deal with this very, very critical bill. The education bill ought to be finished. We worked on it in a very constructive way, I have felt. There has been progress—limited, but, nonetheless, progress. We could have had a lot more progress. There is no reason why we can't finish this bill. There is no reason why we couldn't have done another bloc of amendments today and some amendments tomorrow. In fact, I think maybe we could have finished the bill this week. That is now impossible. And there is no prospect of bringing the bill up at least for the foreseeable future, given what the majority leader has indicated is his intention with regard to appropriations bills. I am troubled and disappointed by that.

I make note of that as we end the day today. Hopefully, we will have more productive weeks and more opportunities to debate this issue. But time is going by quickly. We don't have that much more time. I hope we can better use the time we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I have had the privilege for the last hour of sitting in

that chair and hearing our colleagues debate the issue of NATO and our place in Europe and the broader national security issues and the specific issue of whether or not we should remain in Kosovo. It is entirely appropriate that this body debate this issue. No one should criticize any Senator for bringing that up or for crafting a piece of legislation designed to focus this Government on an exit strategy. Everyone knows we need one.

I add my voice to that of Senator LUGAR, Senator LEVIN, and others, who have expressed concern that while it is appropriate to debate, it is not appropriate to leave at this moment. I wish I could say it is time to leave, but I believe America still has a place in Europe. I believe if we set in motion the wheels to leave Kosovo, we will set in motion the mechanism to decouple the United States and NATO with Europe. I think we need to be very thoughtful about that.

I wish Mr. Putin and the new Russian Federation well, and I hope they join the democratic nations of Europe. I hope we can include them in more ways than ever imaginable throughout all of my lifetime. But I think the jury is still out. I hear from their neighbors, still, they are afraid of what happened in Chechnya. The Nation of Georgia trembles. I know Moldovians do, I know Ukrainians do, I know Romanians do. They have all been in my office this week, worried that the United States would pull out its stabilizing influence, an influence that, frankly, these emerging democracies look to, count on, and still need. I know we are tired of it. I know we are tired of funding it. I know our fighting men and women don't like being in a police operation.

But I also know the cost of leaving Europe is a cost that is much larger than the one we are paying now to stay in Europe. I hope President Clinton and Madeleine Albright and others in our executive branch can figure out how we can get out of there, but get out in a way that does not destroy this institution called NATO, which the world still needs. As Senator LUGAR said, that day may come, that we can go home and the Europeans say goodbye, but that day is not now.

I think we should have a vigorous debate, but I think we should be exceedingly careful before we say to our European allies and to everyone watching the United States and counting on the United States, that we are pulling out of Dodge. I don't think we can say that yet. I hope we can say it soon. But I know we can't say it now.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES IN OREGON

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I have come to talk to citizens of my State who have a rare privilege in the next few days: The two leading candidates for the highest office in our land will be in the State of Oregon. Vice President GORE will be there tomorrow, and Governor Bush will be

there on Tuesday. I will have occasion to be with Governor Bush, and my friend and colleague, RON WYDEN, will have occasion to be with Vice President GORE tomorrow.

Oregonians need to ask a lot of questions to find out where these men are on issues that affect their lives. I came to speak in terms similar to those of Senator GORTON, who wants Washingtonians to ask what I want Oregonians to ask; that is, Mr. Vice President, where are you on the issue of hydroelectric power on the four Snake River dams in the State of Washington? I am not sure I know of an issue of greater importance to our State's environment and our State's economy. As a background to this question, Mr. GORE, where are you on the question of breaching these dams?

I would like to talk a little bit about our energy policy in this country. So I say to any Oregonians that may be watching, I want to share a memo which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY SECRETARY RICHARDSON ANNOUNCES SIX SHORT-TERM ACTIONS TO HELP PREVENT POWER OUTAGES

STRESSES NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE TO PROTECT RELIABILITY IN THE LONG TERM

Energy Secretary Bill Richardson today announced a series of short-term actions that the Department of Energy will take to help ensure the reliability of the nation's power supply in the coming months. Several regions across the country have experienced reliability problems in recent summers and there are concerns about the reliability of the nation's grid this summer.

These short-term actions by the Department of Energy, while not a cure-all, are designed to help keep the lights on this summer," said Secretary Richardson. "To protect reliability in the long term, we need new policies and passage of federal electricity legislation to keep pace with rapidly changing market developments.

The Department of Energy will: work with other agencies to identify opportunities to reduce electric consumption at federal water projects during times of peak demand; urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and state utility commissions to solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak time periods. For instance, large industrial consumers could find it to their advantage to sell their power entitlement back to their utility if it would be profitable; explore opportunities for the use of existing backup generators during power supply emergencies to reduce the strain on electric systems and help avoid blackouts; conduct an emergency exercise with state and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies; work closely with the utility industry to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible; and prepare public service announcements to provide tips to help consumers reduce electricity use and lower their bills.

Secretary Richardson began a series of regional summits this week between federal, state and local government officials, regulators, utilities and consumers to discuss ways to enhance the reliability of our electric system. The first meetings are taking

place on April 24 in Hartford, Newark and New Orleans. On April 28, he will co-host a summit in Sacramento.

After last summer's outages Secretary Richardson formed a Power Outage Study Team to review the events of last year and provide recommendations for making the nation's grid more reliable. The team's final report, issued last month, is available online at <http://www.policy.energy.gov>.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. This is a news release from Department of Energy Secretary Richardson announcing six short-term actions to help prevent power outages.

This will blow your mind.

We are expecting power outages all over the United States this summer. The long-term forecast for the Pacific Northwest is for energy shortages, as well. If you look at the six proposals for what this Government is going to do, there isn't one proposal about producing energy. The first one is: Look for opportunities to reduce electric consumption at Federal water projects.

Let me tell the farmers what that means, they are turning off the switch and they are turning off the water. That is what that means.

Second, solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak times. Do you know what that means, Mr. President? That means the rates are going up. It is like a tax increase. So the cost of your energy is going up. We are not going to produce any more, Heaven forbid, we are just going to make it more expensive.

The next actions prescribed: The Energy Department will conduct an emergency exercise with State and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies. So we essentially will do a fire drill to see what happens when a whole city shuts down because electricity isn't produced when hitting a switch. Somebody has to turn something before we can have lights.

The next one prescribed: the Government is going to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible.

Great. We don't already have that information?

Finally, we are going to prepare public service announcements to provide tips for how you can conserve electricity.

Nothing in the news release about producing.

When Mr. GORE and Mr. Bush are in the State of Oregon, I want Oregonians to ask about our power. I want them to ask how are our lights going to go on at night? How are we going to stay warm in the winter? How are our factories going to continue to operate? How will we have jobs?

This is not a hypothetical situation I am posing. These are real potential threats.

In spite of all of that, the Vice President is talking about shutting down any offshore drilling. Fine, but realize that has a cost to the environment.

Talk about not renewing nuclear licenses for energy plants—but that has an environmental cost as well. I see Senator BYRD on the floor all the time, decrying how the coal fields of West Virginia are being shut down because this Administration does not want to produce any more coal. I hear the people in the northeastern United States screaming about skyrocketing fuel prices in the winter, yet we are becoming more dependent upon foreign oil. Now I hear this Administration, in my neck of the woods, the Pacific Northwest, saying they are going to tear out our hydroelectric power.

It is not unreasonable, my fellow Americans, to ask how are the lights going to go on? Our own Energy Department is admitting we have a problem on the horizon. I think the whole country was just reminded that gasoline does not come from a filling station. It is \$2 a gallon and climbing in some cases, falling in others, I hope.

We need an energy policy.

I support conservation initiatives. Raise CAFE standards? I am for that. I am looking for ways to conserve. But Americans are demanding energy and this Administration's policy is to shut down domestic energy production and leave America more dependent on foreign oil. This does not add up.

I hope Oregonians understand that it is very important to ask the Vice President of the United States what his policy on energy is. Mr. Bush has already answered it. He said if he is elected President, the dams will stay and you will keep your jobs and the lights will go on at night. I like that answer. It is clear.

He also made the point that we can have our energy and we can have our fish as well. Let me tell you a real dirty little secret. As we speak, all that can be heard here in Washington is the gloom and doom about the fish going away. Do you know that in the Columbia/Snake Rivers right now, those rivers are teeming with salmon coming back to spawn?

Let me give some numbers. As of today, at the furthest dam they want to take out, called the Lower Granite, 18,000 chinook have passed through this season. Some say, "Oh, but they must be hatchery fish." To those I say no, they are not. A few of the fish are from hatchery stock, but many of them are wild. Do you know how many fish passed through this same dam last year? It was 240. This year it was 18,000. These numbers have many in the environmental community looking pretty ashen-faced.

The first dam on the Columbia River that the fish pass through is called the Bonneville Dam, a dam Franklin Roosevelt dedicated, I believe in 1936. As of today, 160,000 spring chinook have passed over that dam this season. These are big returns. There are lots of fish returning. In fact, there are so many coming back that the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is clubbing nearly every fish they can find

that is a hatchery fish. They are killing them so they will not spawn because they say that hatchery stock affects the ethnic purity of the wild stocks.

The real secret about hatchery fish is that their eggs come from wild fish. But, nevertheless, we have so many fish now, apparently, that we have the luxury of clubbing them to death before they can spawn. By the way, the hatchery fish in the Atlantic salmon recovery program are treated the same as wild fish. But in spite of all this, we're told in the Pacific Northwest that we have to take out our dams. We have to take them out in order to have a normative river.

What do we hear from the administration? We hear on the one hand that Fish and Wildlife has concluded the dams have to come out. The National Marine Fisheries Service says we need to study dam breaching for at least 10 years because we do not have a good answer yet. And, by the way, the studies they have been producing are all predicated on data from 1980 to the current date. However, if you look at data dating back to 1960, which is available, you do not come up with extinction modeling. But federal agencies just picked the years that had the worst ocean conditions to argue that the salmon are going to become extinct unless we tear out our dams. I want the fish but I don't want the people to be suckers. I think we are being set up to be that.

I would like to know, also from Mr. GORE, why it is that the Corps of Engineers was about to issue their recommendation, which was don't take the dams out, and they were ordered by the White House not to make that recommendation? Why were they ordered to make no recommendation? What that adds up to, I believe, is that this is not about science—this is about political science. Political science is not the basis upon which this decision should be made, particularly when our rivers are full of fish as we speak.

What are the consequences if they pull the dams out? I have named a few already, but I do know it adds 13 cents a bushel to every farmer's wheat. I know it means \$11 million a year lost in revenue to the barging industry. When you take this wheat from the barges and put it on a truck, do you know how many trucks it takes to replace those barges per day? It takes 2,000 semi trucks a day. You say you care about the environment? Are you going to burn that kind of fuel, burn up those kinds of miles, cause that kind of congestion in the city of Portland and the city of Seattle? Not on my watch you will not.

What else does tearing out the dams mean? It means a loss of about \$130 million in property values to farmers. What does that mean to property taxes? School support? Roads? All those things are in jeopardy if you take those dams down. Dam breaching takes 37,000 acres of wheat out of production.

What happens to those families? Their land goes back to sagebrush.

It takes at least 5,370 direct jobs in Portland. I actually think it is higher than that when you look at the ripple effect. When you take out these dams, you lose longshoremen in Portland and the many other service-related jobs that depend on them. Not only that, but to take these dams out, it would cost \$809 million. Some have said that it could cost that much for each dam—I don't know whether we can get through this body an appropriation to destroy Federal assets that will be in the billions of dollars. What are you going to replace the energy with? What are you going to burn? This is crazy.

What else do you lose? You lose 3,033 megawatts of clean hydroelectric power. That is the amount it takes to run the city of Seattle every day. We are going to take that out in the face of projected energy shortages? Not on my watch.

So I say with the Senator from Washington: No, not on our watch.

I say to my fellow citizens in Oregon, this is the most important question you can ask Al Gore. Governor Bush has answered it. Please, Mr. Vice President, tell us what is your position on tearing out hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest? One of your agencies says do it. Another says we don't know enough yet. A third says don't do it. And GORE is refusing to answer the question.

We can have our fish and we can have our power. There are many things we can do, short of destroying our energy infrastructure and our clean, hydroelectric power. There are many things we can do to save fish short of the destruction of this kind of energy. To replace our clean energy with any other type, you are going to burn something and Oregonians will live in a dirtier place. I do not want them to.

I ask the Vice President, respectfully, to answer the question. What is your policy on dam breaching?

EUROPEAN UNION HUSHKIT REGULATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, is a specialized agency of the U.N. that has been tasked for more than 50 years with the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation. Based in Montreal, this 185 countries strong organization develops international standards on such critical issues as noise, emissions, and air worthiness.

I am saddened to report that, last week, the European Union dealt a severe blow to the integrity and future viability of this critical organization. I, of course, am speaking of the EU's implementation of the so-called hushkit regulation. This regulation bans hushkitted aircraft from being registered in Europe, prohibits such aircraft that are not European registered from flying in Europe within

two years, and bars certain reengineed aircraft with low by-pass ratios from European airspace. The regulation was implemented despite the fact that the aircraft in question meet the highest international noise standards.

Thankfully, in March, the U.S. filed an Article 84 case within ICAO against the fifteen EU Member States arguing that the regulation violated the Chicago Convention. ICAO will review the matter this fall, and hopefully resolve it in a way that reaffirms its position as the sole, international standard setting body.

Ironically, the EU wants to have its cake and eat it too. EU Members States are now anxious for ICAO to establish new, more stringent, Stage 4 noise standards. Indeed, the U.S. is working with ICAO on this endeavor as we speak. The key question becomes, why should we develop new standards if the EU has demonstrated that the old ones can be disregarded at whim? If the EU wants Stage 4, it must begin by demonstrating its respect for Stage 3 by withdrawing the hushkit regulation.

Mr. President, I will be following the resolution of this dispute very carefully. It is critical to future trading opportunities that the integrity of the ICAO process be upheld.

SECURITY AND COMMERCIAL SATELLITE IMAGERY

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I am concerned about an emerging issue that has important implications for our national security: the commercial satellite imaging industry. Soon the public will have access to high resolution pictures able to show objects as small as three feet in size.

The rapid evolution of satellite technology has suddenly made the "eye in the sky" accessible to everyone, from foreign governments to the average individual. Secret sites are suddenly no longer secret. Photos of Area 51, a top-secret military installation located in Nevada, were recently made available by a private company selling commercial satellite images. The wide availability of these pictures to any person or country that can afford to buy them has the potential to both help or hinder our security.

Initially satellites were used during the Cold War for defense purposes. These classified images were only available to the government. However, civilians began to benefit from satellite pictures about thirty years ago when the government satellite, Landsat, began to sell photos to the public for agricultural planning purposes. The first commercial satellite launch did not occur until 1986, when France, Sweden and Belgium jointly launched SPOT I.

The technology of satellites today has evolved considerably since

Landsat, in 1972, began providing photos to the public. Those pictures could only render images of objects larger than 250 feet across.

This all changed when earlier this year a private company called Space Imaging made history by distributing the first high-resolution satellite images of a North Korean ballistic missile site. Their photos had a one-meter resolution, providing the public a detailed look at the missile facilities of this rogue nation. Ruts in the road used by North Korean trucks could be seen.

The industry for commercial satellites is growing steadily. In 1994 President Clinton issued Presidential Decision Directive 23 which permitted the Commerce Department to license 12 U.S. companies to operate remote-sensing satellites. Space Imaging and Aerial Images, the company which took the Area 51 pictures, may be the first two of these companies to get a satellite aloft, but there are more to come. At least two other U.S. companies plan on launching satellites this year and several foreign companies have similar plans.

Legal restrictions surrounding these photo purchases are few. Imaging companies do not have to identify either their customers or their pictures. An amendment to the 1997 Defense Authorization Act prohibits U.S. companies from selling satellite images of Israel that show objects with a diameter under 6 feet. Any sale of images to a terrorist state or any regime under U.S. or international sanctions is also prohibited. Aside from these restrictions, there are virtually no limitations on any satellite or any sale of satellite pictures. And even these restrictions are going to be harder to maintain as competition increases from more companies outside the United States.

At the moment, the images are expensive, limited in coverage but not difficult to purchase. Foreign governments, private groups or individuals can now place their orders. In a competitive market with more countries offering this service, there will be competition to provide more precise pictures, of a greater number of subjects, in a more timely manner, at less cost. The restrictions the U.S. now imposes will be harder to maintain in such a free market. What was secret once, will be secret no longer.

Pictures of Area 51, for example, were provided by a Russian launched satellite. India is also beginning a program to launch high-resolution imaging satellites and Israel is planning to launch its own commercial satellite. American restrictions on satellite images of Israel only apply to American satellites. Soon commercial satellites will also be using radar imaging—and thus will no longer be limited by the need for clear skies—and hyperspectral sensors which permit analysis of chemical characteristics. The United States government has long been part of the action. NASA's Commercial Remote

Sensing Program is based at the Stennis Space Center in Mississippi.

But it is clear that as this competitive industry grows in the future, we should examine the impact of commercial satellites on our nation's security. Many have applauded the growth of this industry as a means of keeping the public well-informed and expanding the national discussion on issues of national and international security. It is true that having access to satellite images of other countries does enable the U.S. to monitor more areas around the world, to identify violations of international agreements, detect human rights abuses and watch for possible security threats. It will mean private, non-governmental organizations, such as the one which commissioned the pictures of North Korea, will be watching the world too, and issuing their intelligence bulletins.

This may result in confusing interpretations. Countries could take advantage of the fact that they may be monitored by one of these satellites. Knowing that they are being photographed by a satellite and that these images may be made public, states could attempt to blackmail the international community by staging what appears to be a more robust nuclear program or preparations for a missile test for the benefit of the threatening images that this would produce. After all pictures do not lie, do they? Or they could do exactly the opposite and disguise their advanced defense capabilities so that the images captured and released to the media actually reinforce a rogue nation's efforts to circumvent international law.

This possibility calls to mind the pictures taken last January of the Nodong missile launch site in North Korea. As I mentioned earlier, those pictures depicted a crude missile site and a launch pad that cuts through a rice paddy, making the North Korean facilities appear primitive and unthreatening. But these observations contradict the September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate which believes North Korea to be the country most likely to develop ICBMs capable of threatening the U.S. during the next fifteen years. If the U.S. accepts these pictures as fact and believes that the North Korean missile site is as unthreatening as it appears, should we let down our guard and disregard the threat they may pose to our country? I think not.

Similarly, in March of this year, satellite photos of Pakistan's nuclear facility and missile garrison were taken by a commercial satellite and sold to a Washington-based arms control organization. These images have sparked a public policy debate over their interpretation and international security implications. The organization that purchased these photos insists that they are proof that Pakistan will not be persuaded to give up its nuclear weapons program. However, a possible misinterpretation of this data could easily incite a flare-up of the already

volatile relationship between Pakistan and India.

We cannot make assumptions about what these pictures mean when constructing our national security policy. Our eyes can deceive us. Photo interpretation is going to open up a new area of commercial employment for former government analysts. This evolving space race of the commercial satellite industry can offer us many military and civilian benefits. It can be an important tool in assisting us to make many of our national security decisions in the future. But we must also be wary about jumping to conclusions from what we see. A single picture may not be worth a thousand words. We must contemplate the use of these commercial satellites carefully and find the way to best utilize them so that they bolster, not threaten, our national security.

Just as Global Positioning System (GPS) navigation devices are now widely accessible, we could have a situation in which an enemy uses GPS to attack an American target identified by commercial satellite imaging. Recently, the White House announced the United States would stop its intentional degradation of the GPS signals available to the public, giving the public access to the precise location system previously possible only for the Department of Defense. Defense is requesting \$500 million in FY2001 to sustain and modernize the GPS program. Much of the technology used in commercial space launches came from the military.

This is a strange new world. We need to gain a greater understanding of the implications of this technology on our national security. The technology may be inherently uncontrollable—just as export controls over computer encryption became impossible to sustain. Satellite imagery has the potential to be a major asset to the arms control, human rights, and environmental communities. We are witnessing the birth of a new area of information technology. I would urge my colleagues to consider this issue as we begin to examine American security in the 21st century.

142ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA INTO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has truly been blessed with a wide array of remarkable gifts. Few places on Earth can boast such diversity amongst its abundant natural resources, prosperous industries, and exceptional people. Today marks the 142nd anniversary of Minnesota's admission as the thirty-second state of the Union, and I want to take this opportunity to reflect on a few of the things that make my state special. This is a difficult speech to make in such a short amount of time, as I am sure I could break Senator THURMOND's twenty-four hour and eighteen minute

filibuster record by talking about Minnesota's contributions to America but I will stick to just a few of the high-lights and try to finish up by sundown.

Minnesota's natural beauty has been photographed and documented time and time again. License plates may proclaim Minnesota to be "The Land of 10,000 Lakes," but in reality, our vast lakes number in excess of 12,000, and we have more than 63,000 miles of natural rivers and streams. But there is something about sitting on the shore of Mille Lacs Lake at dawn on a Saturday in July that even a two-page spread in National Geographic cannot capture.

Minnesotans have a unique relationship with their great outdoors. Many take advantage of our pristine environment through a large assortment of activities, such as taking a week to canoe through the Boundary Waters or going for a walk along the Mississippi River over a lunch hour. Minnesota is a true sportsman's paradise. Our unique habitat creates some of the best hunting and fishing in the country. We are proud of our outdoor heritage, and take seriously our commitment to maintaining the delicate balance between protecting the environment and the responsible use of our resources.

Nor are we shy about sharing our bounty with others. Minnesota welcomes more than 20 million vacationers every year, who support 170,300 tourism jobs and return \$9.1 billion to the local economy. Yet, for all those visitors, our state offers places of such solitude that a camper or canoeist can travel for a week and spot any number of deer, bears, and bald eagles, but never see another person.

The influence of agriculture on Minnesota life and traditions cannot be overstated. Even as family farms struggle in today's difficult market, the resilience and dedication of our farmers establishes the backbone of the Minnesota economy. One in every four Minnesota jobs is tied to the agriculture industry in some way. Minnesota has become a national leader in international exports, as our producers export billions of dollars worth of grains, meats, and other products every year. I am proud of my ongoing efforts to ensure that even more world markets are opened to Minnesota agriculture products—they are among the best products in the world, and they should be shared. Many of the nation's top job providers call Minnesota home. Well-known names like General Mills, Pillsbury, 3M, Target, and Cargill have deep roots within our communities. Aside from the economic impacts made by our corporate community, there is an impressive philanthropic presence in the state. For example, Cargill's generous contributions to causes such as education, environment, and youth programs total in the tens of millions of dollars.

Firms such as Medtronic and St. Jude Medical are national leaders in the bio-medical industry. Their products have given hope to those who pre-

viously faced a bleak medical outlook. Other Minnesota organizations are searching for answers to tomorrow's problems—today. The world-renowned Mayo Clinic not only treats over half a million patients a year, but is leading the charge against the mysteries of mankind's deadly diseases through its ongoing research.

Of all the successful companies, natural beauty, and bountiful resources Minnesota plays host to, the real treasures are the people of my state. Successful Minnesotans come from all walks of life. Some of the most prolific writers of the past century have hailed from the North Star State. The first American to be awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature was Sinclair Lewis, a native of Sauk Centre, Minnesota. F. Scott Fitzgerald, Jon Hassler, and Garrison Keillor are all writers we are proud to call our own.

Something about the fresh air in Minnesota inspires us to do bigger and better things. Charles Lindbergh must have gotten a big whiff of that air; so did Judy Garland, Kevin McHale, and Bob Dylan, just to name a few. Our state and nation recently mourned the loss of one of our most beloved natives. Charles Schulz captured the hearts of young and old alike with his long-running Peanuts comic strip, and we will miss him each and every Sunday.

There are many Minnesota celebrities who have contributed to the richness of our nation, but the people who really deserve the applause and recognition are the men and women who day in and day out strive to make their communities, state, and nation a better place to live. The farmer who harvests our nation's corn, the police-woman who patrols the streets, the stay-at-home mom who supervises a household of kids, and the volunteer who takes the time to visit a disabled veteran rarely receive the accolades they deserve. These people are as indispensable to the growing, bustling community of St. Michael-Albertville as they are to the thriving metropolis of Minneapolis-St. Paul. I applaud them and am proud to represent each of them here in the United States Senate.

The quality of life in Minnesota is outstanding for a reason. Ideals such as hard work, dedication, personal responsibility, and a true passion for life are all essential to my state's success. Growing up on a Minnesota dairy farm, I was fortunate enough to witness these qualities and their importance at a very young age.

And for any of my colleagues who may be wondering, you don't have to be a native to spread the "Minnesota Nice" spirit. For example, some of the most outstanding Minnesota citizens are those from its many ethnic communities. Their devotion and contribution to Minnesota's way of life is commendable, and representative of the way our state seems to bring out the very best in its people.

I am deeply proud of my state, Mr. President, and representing her and her

citizens is a great honor. So, on this 142nd anniversary of our statehood, I encourage Minnesotans to take time to discover something new about our state and ponder some of the many treasures with which we have been blessed. Visit one of our sky-tinted lakes, the Mall of America, Split Rock Lighthouse, Fort Snelling, or even the world's largest ball of twine. Take pride in our state and continue the efforts to make Minnesota an even better place to call home.●

CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, for the eighth year in a row, the Uniform Crime Report indicates that violent crime has decreased across our country. In 1999, the number of murders, rapes, aggravated assaults, robberies, and property crimes decreased eight percent in the Midwest and seven percent overall. While crime experts will argue endlessly on the reasons behind this remarkable trend, I believe that local, state, and federal law enforcement are primarily responsible for making our streets safer than a decade before.

While I am pleased with the results of this new report, it is important to remember that behind every crime statistic, there is a child, a spouse, a relative, or a friend that has been victimized. Even one crime is too many because that crime victim has been violated in a way that forever changes their life. In our country's haste to focus on what should happen to the criminal, the victim is too often overlooked. That doesn't have to be the case, and I believe that more should be done to assist crime victims in South Dakota and around the country.

As a former prosecutor, I am well aware that victimization in and of itself is terrible to cope with, let alone the anguish of a legal proceeding and restitution recovery. The voice of the victim should be heard at every step of the criminal process, and local and state programs should have adequate resources to effectively deal with crime victims.

States have taken the lead in protecting the rights of crime victims, and it is time for the federal government to follow suit. South Dakota provides a number of specific "victim's rights" including the right to restitution, notices of scheduled hearings and releases, an explanation of the criminal charges and process, and the opportunity to present a written or oral victim impact statement at trial. South Dakota also has victim/witness assistants in many of the prosecutor's offices across the state who work with crime victims on a daily basis.

I am a cosponsor of the Crime Victims Assistance Act which enhances victims' rights for federal crimes and provides several grants for state and local prosecutors, judges, prison employees, and law enforcement officials

to improve their handling of crime victims as well. However, instead of passing this important piece of legislation that would have an immediate impact on state and local efforts to improve crime victims services, some in Congress prefer to focus their attention on proposals to amend the United States Constitution. I have reservations about amending the constitution while Congress has the ability to enact legislation instead to accomplish the same goal. I am more concerned that this focus on a constitutional amendment has slowed the pace of crime victim legislation over the past several years. It is critical that Congress pass and the President sign into law the Crime Victims Assistance Act this year.

In addition to the Crime Victims Assistance Act, Congress must pass this year the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA II). Since enactment of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, the number of forcible rapes of women have declined, and the number of sexual assaults nationwide have gone down as well. South Dakota organizations have received \$6.7 million in federal funding for domestic abuse programs and \$1.6 million in federal funding for battered women's shelters.

Despite the success of the Violence Against Women Act, domestic abuse and violence against women continue to plague our communities. Consider the fact that a woman is raped every five minutes in this country and more women are injured by domestic violence each year than by automobile accidents and cancer deaths combined. Local and state officials should have access to more—not fewer—resources to address domestic violence, and it is critical that programs authorized through VAWA II receive stable levels of funding for the next five years.

Supporters of a constitutional amendment for crime victims have withdrawn their proposal from consideration on the Senate floor this year. I am hopeful that my colleagues will seize this opportunity to continue the very valuable discussion on crime victims' rights and work to pass the Crime Victims Assistance Act and VAWA II as soon as possible.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, May 10, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,664,193,479,449.87 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-four billion, one hundred ninety-three million, four hundred seventy-nine thousand, four hundred forty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents).

One year ago, April 26, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,571,920,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred seventy-one billion, nine hundred twenty million).

Five years ago, May 10, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,856,767,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fifty-six billion, seven hundred sixty-seven million).

Ten years ago, May 10, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,075,637,000,000 (Three trillion, seventy-five billion, six hundred thirty-seven million).

Fifteen years ago, May 10, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,739,232,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred thirty-nine billion, two hundred thirty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of almost \$4 trillion—\$3,924,961,479,449.87 (Three trillion, nine hundred twenty-four billion, nine hundred sixty-one million, four hundred seventy-nine thousand, four hundred forty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 15 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ON THE RETIREMENT OF GORDON C. KERR

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a member of my staff, an advisor, and a man I feel honored to call my friend, Gordon Kerr.

Gordon, who has served as my Chief of Staff since 1982, has retired from government service to join the National Trust for Historic Preservation as the Director of Congressional Affairs. His 17 years as my top aide made him the dean of Senate Chiefs of Staff.

Gordon has served me for these many years in a variety of ways. He has been an invaluable advisor on issues of public policy and legislative strategy, as well as on personal and political matters. He has a clear-eyed, straightforward, right-in-your-face way of evaluating issues and events, and expressing his opinion about them which makes it nearly impossible to walk a bad idea past him. At least not without his calling you on it.

And yet, the first thing that anyone who knows Gordon immediately says is, "what a wonderful human being". How does a plain-speaking, realist like Gordon, come to be so uniformly regarded with such warmth and affection? It's simple when you think about it. Gordon is so open, principled, ethical and kind-hearted in his approach to the people he comes in contact with that it is nearly impossible to take offense at his candid advice. I'm reminded of what I've read about Robert Kennedy who also was known both for his brusque, sometimes harsh candor, but also for his high principles, and thoughtful consideration of others. "My, he is unassimilated, isn't he?" poet Robert Lowell was reported to have said when he first met him.

In all, Gordon spent more than 30 years on Capitol Hill, beginning as a Legislative Assistant for former-Congressman James Scheuer of New York in 1970, joining former-Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas in 1973, and then working for former-Congressman Jonathan Bingham of New York from 1973 until 1982, when he joined my staff as Chief of Staff. Gordon is a graduate of Yale University with a B.A. degree

in Political Science and he holds a Masters degree in Public Administration with Distinction from American University, awarded in 1980. He served in the United States Navy as an Intelligence Officer for three years.

In 1990, Gordon served as my campaign manager. Former Senator Eugene McCarthy, with his wonderful irreverent sense of humor, once remarked that practicing politics is a little "like being a football coach; you have to be smart enough to understand the game, but dumb enough to think it's important." Well, Gordon is a brilliant strategist, an outstanding "coach", and although his acute sense of humor would appreciate Senator McCarthy's self-deprecating quip, nonetheless he's always known the importance of the game. He's proud of the work he's done in the Senate as a public servant, and rightly so. And, he's proud of his work in the world of campaigns and politics, doing his part on that tough battleground. He was ever-conscious of the role of politics, which we sometimes tend to forget, in the accountability which is at the heart of the democratic system.

Characteristic of Gordon is his ability to see things from a new, fresh, sometimes unique angle. In a time when even the public policy debate is increasingly driven by political polls, television sound-bites, and oversimplified sloganeering, it was particularly valuable to me to have his contributions. Even when I did not ultimately adopt his viewpoint or accept his recommendation, having the benefit of Gordon's input nearly always informed my decisions.

While Gordon has been a dedicated public servant and loyal and hard-working employee, his first priority has always been his wonderful family. His love of his wife Suzy, his son Charlie and daughter Sarah were evident in his voice whenever he spoke of them and in the special sparkle in his eyes when he was with them. I know I speak not only for myself and the Levin family, but for the entire Levin staff and many in the Senate family, when I say we will miss Gordon and the Kerr family. Fortunately, in his new role at the National Trust for Historic Preservation he won't be too far away.

Mr. President, I owe Gordon Kerr a great debt for the loyal service which he has performed; and I believe that all of us here in the Senate, in my home state of Michigan, and in the nation, owe a debt of gratitude to him and the many like him who serve us here. This tribute to Gordon Kerr, in a small way, is an effort to recognize that role.●

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD KEHOE

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary Vermonter and a determined leader, Edward Kehoe. Ed Kehoe was born in Rutland, my hometown, to the late James and Grace Kehoe and graduated from Rutland High School

before serving in the U.S. Army with the 26th Infantry Regiment during World War II. As a decorated war hero, Ed Kehoe returned to Vermont to own and operate Kehoe's Diner in Hydeville.

Ed Kehoe served as the town manager of Castleton from 1955 to 1965 before being elected the Vermont House for a single term. In August 1965, Ed Kehoe was appointed to head the Fish and Game Department where he served as the Vermont fish and wildlife commissioner under four governors until he retired in August 1982. He was an avid sportsman and member of an many Vermont sportsmen organizations until his death in late April. At the time of his appointment Ed Kehoe was initially troubled by his lack of a "professional" background in biology or wildlife management. However, his experience as a hunter and angler gave him the needed edge.

Led by his ability to draw on experience and heed the advice of biologists, Ed Kehoe led the Vermont crusade to resist development pressures. During his 17-year tenure as commissioner, Ed Kehoe established two Green Mountain Conservation camps to help teach younger Vermonters how to fish and camp, helped to improve the state warden force, expanded the statewide Hunter Safety Program, and worked to restore Connecticut River salmon and wild turkeys throughout Vermont. Perhaps Ed Kehoe's greatest contribution to the state was his ability to push, acquire, and protect lands with significant wildlife and recreation value.

Ed Kehoe's most recent award speaks to his accomplishments. Last year the Rutland Herald honored his visionary concerns about nongame species and protection of important property by naming him, "Outdoorsman of the Century." John Hall, spokesman with Fish and Wildlife Department, recently alluded to Ed Kehoe's achievement, "Ed wanted to make sure we were passing on the hunting and fishing traditions to future generations of Vermonter to enjoy. He always had the everyday Vermonter in mind, the average person of average means. He was the supreme steward of fish and wildlife resources."

I pay tribute today to a man who paid tribute every day, to the values the everyday Vermonter holds dear. We have lost an extraordinary man, but his contributions to Vermont wildlife policy will live on.●

TAIWANESE AMERICAN WEEK

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this month I join Americans throughout Wisconsin and across the nation in celebrating Taiwanese American Heritage Week, honoring the many important contributions to American society of the more than half a million Taiwanese Americans in the United States. Without the contributions of Taiwanese Americans, we would lack the important AIDS research of Dr. David Ho. We would be denied the work of Nobel Laureate chemist Dr. Lee

Yuan-Tse and that of the many American scientists he inspired. We would not be able to search for information on the internet by using Yahoo, co-founded by Jerry Yang. Thousands of Taiwanese Americans throughout the country have made important achievements in a wide range of sectors, including doctors, teachers, lawyers, and computer technology experts. They have improved the lives of their fellow American citizens, and they will play an integral role in our future.

Besides their many contributions here at home, Taiwanese Americans have also played a vital role in the political transformation of Taiwan. For many years, they organized letter-writing campaigns, planned marches and demonstrations, and talked to any U.S. policy-maker who would listen about their dreams for Taiwan's future as free and democratic. Many risked arrest in—or exile from—their homeland as a result of their activities. The tireless work of Taiwanese Americans helped ensure the success of Taiwan's democratic evolution, beginning with the lifting of martial law in 1987 and culminating with the first fully democratic presidential election in 1996. These are achievements that all Americans can celebrate. I join Taiwanese Americans in congratulating the winners of the March presidential elections in Taiwan.

Mr. President, Taiwanese American Heritage Week recognizes the long-standing friendship between the people of the United States and Taiwan, and celebrates our shared values. I commend the great accomplishments and contributions of the Taiwanese American community.●

BE KIND TO ANIMALS WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of "Be Kind to Animals Week." This week is a time to draw attention to how important animals are to our lives and to make sure they receive the treatment and protection they deserve.

The American Humane Association was founded in 1877 with a goal to unite a few groups to give a national voice to those who could not speak for themselves: animals. The Association established Be Kind to Animals Week in 1915, the first national week specifically for animals and now the oldest week of its kind in existence in this country.

This is the 85th year "Be Kind to Animals Week" will be celebrated. The leader of the American Humane Association in 1915 was Dr. William O. Stillman, who foresaw this week continuing on "as annual events to stimulate and revive human thought."

The three main goals of the first Be Kind to Animals Week were to encourage the clergy to spread the message about kindness to animals by observing Humane Sunday, to visit schools and teach children the message of being humane, and to publicize the good works

of our nation's humane societies. These noble goals continue on today through the American Humane Association.

Mr. President, I would like to recognize the many Humane Societies in my home state of Minnesota. These organizations are on the front lines of standing up for and protecting animals across Minnesota. By visiting a local animal shelter, I know many citizens have bettered not only the lives of countless animals through adoption, but surely their own lives in the process. The staffs and volunteers of Minnesota Humane Societies continue to make this possible for all citizens—and their efforts to teach people the importance of spay-neuter programs have also been extremely helpful.

Animals certainly have a tremendous effect on our lives. Domesticated animals are considered family members to many of us. Farm animals provide nourishment to families here at home and around the world. And wild animals provide a balance to our overall ecosystem.

I am sure Dr. Stillman would be extremely pleased to see his plan of having an annual week to remember the important role of animals continuing on in its 85th year. I want to urge everyone to use this week to take a minute and reflect on what animals mean to our lives, and how we can continue to give animals the protection and care they deserve every day.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BUNKER

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a distinguished Nevadan, a good man, and a good friend, Mr. Richard Bunker. Richard will be receiving the National Jewish Medical and Research Center's Humanitarian Award on June 3, 2000. The Humanitarian Award recognizes individuals who have made significant civic and charitable contributions, and whose concern is not personal, but for the greater community. There is no one more deserving of this honor than Richard Bunker.

Richard's legacy of service to the state of Nevada is long and remarkable. He has served as Assistant City Manager of Las Vegas and Clark County Manager, before being appointed Chairman of the prestigious State Gaming Control Board, and is now a member of the Colorado River Commission while being a member of the Board of Trustees for the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union Welfare/Pension Funds. I was Chairman of the Gaming Commission when Richard was Chairman of the Gaming Control Board. We were partners then and still are.

As Chairman of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, Richard is Nevada's ambassador on the Colorado River. With shrewdness and finesse, he has developed positive relations with officials of the Colorado River basin states. His political skill has firmly re-established Nevada as a player on the important issues of the Colorado River

community. He also made the critically needed expansion of Southern Nevada water facilities a reality when he brokered a financial plan with the business, developer, and gaming communities.

Over the years, Richard Bunker has also been recognized by a variety of distinguished organizations. In 1993, he received the prestigious Distinguished Nevadan of the Year award from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The Anti-Defamation League honored Richard with the Distinguished Community Service Award in 1996. In June 1999, he was presented with the Lifetime Achievement Award by the Nevada Gaming Attorneys and the Clark County Bar Association.

For those of us who have had the pleasure to work closely with Richard, as I have, the above awards pale in comparison to his true grit. He is knowledgeable of the system of government and totally aware of the magic of our system of free enterprise. For the growth and development of southern Nevada, no one for the past twenty-five years has played a more key role than Richard Bunker.

On a more personal note, Richard has played an important part in my political endeavors. He has been an advisor, counselor, and sounding board. Above all else, he is a good listener, for this Richard, I am grateful.

I extend to you my congratulations and the appreciation of all Nevadans for your good work on their behalf.●

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL WESLEY CLARK

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, last week, in a EUCOM change of command ceremony, General Wesley Clark relinquished his position as Supreme Allied Commander Europe, concluding one of his generation's most illustrious and eventful military careers. As he testifies before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence today, I want to highlight the contributions of General Clark to the national security of the United States and to its friends and allies in Europe and around the globe, and thank him for his service to NATO as Supreme Allied Commander Europe.

As NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson put it: Wes Clark has been the right man, in the right place, at the right time. He has been instrumental in bringing a degree of stability to Bosnia-Herzegovina, so that efforts at reconstruction and reconciliation could proceed. General Clark welcomed three new members to the Alliance and has worked tirelessly to integrate them fully—militarily and politically—into the activities and decision-making processes of the Alliance. The General has worked to turn the Partnerships for Peace into stepping stones rather than alternatives to Alliance membership, and he has kept the door open to new entrants, while setting forth high military standards for full integration.

But nowhere have General Clark's political and leadership qualities been

more evident than during NATO's Kosovo campaign. Having been a key participant in diplomatic efforts seeking a solution to Yugoslavia's ethnic turmoil and disintegration, General Clark changed hats without missing a beat and assumed command of the Alliance strategy to complement diplomacy with military power. General Clark's steadfast pursuit of military victory coupled with the maintenance of political cohesion in Alliance planning cells at NATO Headquarters brought the Western coalition to one of its finest hours in its 50-year history.

Equally important, General Clark recognized that military success could not produce peace, prosperity and stability on the ground without an effective civil implementation program that allowed the peoples of the Balkans the tools to address their historical grievances toward one another. He knew that the political unity he helped to forge as a prerequisite to military success must now be sustained and strengthened if the civilianization process is to succeed.

Secretary of Defense Cohen put it well at the EUCOM Change of Command ceremony last week in Europe. He said:

In General Wes Clark, America found a scholar, a soldier and a statesman: a scholar of unquestioned courage, a bronze and silver star hero who, despite grievous wounds, inspired his unit to survive in the jungles of Vietnam; a soldier of insight who returned to train those who prevailed in Desert Storm. He is a statesman whose influence has been felt from the Americas where he helped to guide the fight against drug barons to Dayton where his counsel helped end the bloodletting in Bosnia.

Those sentiments are shared by those of us in the Senate who have benefitted from General Clark's wise counsel over the years. He was never too busy for one more briefing at NATO Headquarters or in the field. When the relevant committees held their hearings, General Clark was on the plane so that he might address Congressional concerns across the table, not across the ocean.

Members of both branches of government are now in the process of assimilating the "lessons learned" from the Kosovo campaign. General Clark has recently completed his own "after action" report. But for the United States, there is one incontrovertible lesson to be learned: If the history of the last year or so in the Balkans were to repeat itself, the United States and the Alliance would be well served by having Wes Clark again at the helm of a coalition of nations intent on defending their common interests.●

RETIREMENT OF DON GUNDERSON

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on May 21, students and former students, their parents, teachers and administrators of Los Altos High School, will come together in Southern California to show their appreciation, and express their thanks and best wishes to Don

Gunderson, who is retiring this year after 41 years as a music educator.

Don Gunderson began his teaching career at the halfway point of President Dwight Eisenhower's second term, working with his mentor in Washington state, teaching instrumental music in the junior high, as well as music to elementary schoolers. Three years later, in 1961, Mr. Gunderson came to Anaheim, California to be the band, orchestra and choir director at Crescent Junior High School, which was still in construction when he was hired. Five years later, he began a very distinguished eleven-year career as the band and orchestra director at Savannah High School in Anaheim. In 1978, Mr. Gunderson rose to the college ranks, serving as head of the jazz and student teacher programs at California State University at Fullerton.

Three years later, in 1981, Don Gunderson decided to return to high school instruction at Los Altos High School, in Hacienda Heights. At that time, Los Altos was one of the largest musical programs in Southern California, with a strong reputation in marching band competitions. For the next nineteen years, Los Altos High School would become more than just the home of one of Southern California's largest marching bands—it would be the site of one of our nation's internationally recognized music education programs. The Los Altos Entertainment Unit has performed at the Fiesta Bowl pageant twice and marched in the Tournament of Roses Parade four times. They've been here in Washington, where they performed at the White House, and traveled for performances in Florida and the Bahamas.

Don Gunderson began building the music program's international credentials in 1982, when he led the Los Altos Entertainment Unit on a two week tour of England and Scotland. Knowing that very few, if any Americans, knew of Hacienda Heights, Mr. Gunderson was prepared when inquiring Brits asked where in the world is Hacienda Heights: "We're not far from Disneyland" was his reply. It's safe to say that after that 1982 trip, along with a return visit ten years later as guests of the British Military as part of the prestigious Royal Tournament, the people of Britain know how to find Hacienda Heights on a map. The same can be said for music-lovers that had the good fortune to see and hear Los Altos perform in Germany, Italy, Austria, and Switzerland. The Los Altos Entertainment Unit has been the recipient of countless awards and achievements. Los Altos was designated the Official Youth Band of the 1984 Summer Olympics, and was crowned three times as marching band champions at the Southern California Tournament of Champions. And that's just the marching band, color guard and dance team. Don Gunderson brought to Los Altos a commitment to a total music program, and strived to establish the same standard of excellence to the orchestral and jazz programs.

Perhaps just as significant are the signs of recognition and respect given to this program in ways other than award ceremonies. Go to a Friday night football game at Los Altos and you're sure to find a few young people from other high schools in Southern California in the stands not to see the football team, but to watch and hear the Entertainment Unit. Those same football games certainly sparked the imaginations of young elementary and junior high school students, who would come home interested in learning music and being a part of the Entertainment Unit. Come to the football field on a night when the Entertainment Unit is rehearsing and you're sure to find parents, students, teachers, former students, and even students from other high schools in the stands. Trace the career paths of those who learned from Don Gunderson and yes, you'll find those who have gone on to rewarding careers in music and music education. However, there are many more alumni of the Los Altos Entertainment Unit that pursued other careers, but they carry with them lessons learned from Don Gunderson on football fields, concert halls, or the band room that go beyond musical notes on a page—lessons in teamwork, preparation, determination, and excellence.

Mr. President, those who have learned and applied these and countless other lessons from Don Gunderson will have an opportunity to say thanks in a few short weeks. Let me join them in expressing my admiration to a man who has brought the joy of music to thousands of students and parents, and to countless more around the world who have heard the stirring opening fanfare, "Conquistadores." Perhaps more important, let me express my own thanks to Don Gunderson for the honor and inspiration he has brought to the teaching profession for more than forty years. To borrow from the Los Altos motto, Don Gunderson has engaged and conquered.

I wish Don Gunderson, his wife Judy and his family, all the very best.●

REAR ADMIRAL STEPHEN TODD FISHER

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Rear Admiral (Upper Half) Stephen Todd Fisher as he retires from the United States Navy after more than thirty-four years of active duty service. For the last five years, Rear Admiral Fisher has been the Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy—the first non-physician officer to serve in that position.

In addition, Rear Admiral Fisher was the first Medical Service Corps officer to be selected by a board to the rank of two-star Admiral within the Department of Defense. He served as the Director of the Medical Service Corps from 1993–1995. RADM Fisher's assignments included tours on the U.S.S. *Repose* (AH 16); Headquarters, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific; various Navy

Hospitals and Clinics; the Naval School of Health Sciences; the office of the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Headquarters for Navy Medicine. He is also the recipient of the 2000 American Hospital Association award for Excellence in Federal Service.

Rear Admiral Fisher's leadership as the Executive Agent for the Department of Defense Clinical Business Area led to the development of a computerized patient record which will be tested and evaluated this summer for government-wide adoption. This accomplishment has been highly praised by the National Library of Medicine Board of Regents and completes the planning segment of the Composite Health Care System II program. As Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Government Computerized Patient Record, Rear Admiral Fisher coordinated linkage between the Department of Veteran's Health Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Indian Health Services. A prototype of the Computerized Patient Record has been developed and will be alpha tested in Alaska in 2001. Under his leadership, the Composite Health Care System II Program Office was selected for the Government Technology Leadership Award and the Smithsonian Technology Award in recognition of its visionary use of information technology.

As a principal member of the Military Health System Information Management Proponent Committee, Rear Admiral Fisher worked closely with the Deputy Surgeons General of the Air Force and Army, and the Executive Director of the Defense Medical Information Management System orchestrating the development, prioritization, and achievement of information management goals for medical readiness and peacetime health care programs for the Department of Defense. His contributions are far-reaching and will positively impact military health care for years to come.

Mr. President, Rear Admiral Fisher's many meritorious awards and decorations demonstrate his contributions in a tangible way, but it is the legacy he leaves behind for the Navy Medical Service Corps, the United States Navy, and the Department of Defense for which we are most appreciative. It is with pride that I congratulate Rear Admiral Fisher on his outstanding career of exemplary service.●

IN MEMORY OF JO-ANN MOLNAR

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to share just a few words about a good friend we recently lost, someone I have known since I first ran for Lieutenant Governor in Massachusetts in 1982, a good hearted and selfless individual who was always an inspiration, Jo-Ann Molnar. Jo-Ann recently passed away after bravely battling cancer, and I know that I am not alone in saying that as someone whose life was touched by Jo-Ann Molnar's service, activism, and warmth, there is today a deep and

profound sense of loss. In Jo-Ann many of us have lost—and today I would like to honor—a committed activist, a person of enormous courage and character and, most simply, a great friend.

I first met Jo-Ann Molnar when I was running for Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, and Jo-Ann approached me at one of our earliest events and offered to help in any way she could. It was on that race in the middle of a difficult and heated campaign that Jo-Ann first demonstrated to me not just that she was an indefatigable volunteer, but that she was one of those individuals who—through her commitment to do what is right, through her belief in politics not as sport but as a fight for principle—could reaffirm precisely why politics matters and why public service is worthwhile.

Jo-Ann and I remained close ever since that first campaign, and I looked forward to and always appreciated Jo-Ann's warm cards and greetings. Always a loyal friend, Jo-Ann would share with me her thoughts on issues of importance, keep me abreast of her accomplishments, and offer me words of encouragement as I worked to find my way in the United States Senate.

It was through her frequent cards and letters—and the occasional happy meeting either in Massachusetts or at political gatherings around the Maryland area—that I learned of the many ways in which Jo-Ann continued to dedicate herself to public service. Her determination to make a difference led her to remarkable achievements. In 1977, Jo-Ann graduated magna cum laude from Fairleigh Dickinson University, with a degree in history and political science. She went on to earn a master's degree in political science from American University. Jo-Ann selflessly offered her leadership to her fellow Democrats, serving admirably as President of the Montgomery County, Maryland Young Democrats, as Vice Chair of the Handicapped Commission in Montgomery County, and on the Board of Directors of the Montgomery County public libraries. In addition to her help with my campaigns, Jo-Ann served as a legislative intern to U.S. Senator Donald Reigle, U.S. Representative Gene Andrew Maguire, and Montgomery County Council member Michael L. Gudis. She also worked as a Congressional Liaison Assistant for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. For almost a decade, Jo-Ann served as a legal researcher for the Human Relations Commission. She gave of herself as a Sunday School teacher and a confirmation teacher at the Foundary United Methodist Church in Washington, D.C., as well as an instructor at Colesville United Methodist Church in Silver Spring, Maryland.

Mr. President, Jo-Ann lived a life true to her ideals of service—service to community, service to faith. I would add, though, that none of these achievements would have been possible if Jo-Ann had not worked so hard to overcome cerebral palsy. Jo-Ann refused to be slowed by her disability—

and in fact rejected the notion that she should in any way lower her expectations for herself or expect different expectations from those to whom she so selflessly offered her best efforts. Jo-Ann was a fighter, and I continually marveled at her drive to rise above what some would view as limitations.

For that reason, Jo-Ann served as one of the best possible advocates and activists for the Americans with Disabilities Act. Honored as a teenager for her activism on the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Jo-Ann kept pushing as an adult to break down barriers in our society that she believed kept disabled Americans from maximizing their contributions to their communities and our nation. Jo-Ann was not just an advocate for legislation to protect and empower disabled Americans—she was the living embodiment of those efforts.

Mr. President, it is difficult to accept that we have all lost a friend in Jo-Ann Molnar, but it is particularly difficult, I know, for Jo-Ann's family—her mother, Helen, and her two sisters, Dorothy and Ilona. They are in our thoughts and prayers.

I was comforted, though, to learn that Jo-Ann was able to enjoy life as she had always done, up until her last days. Jo-Ann's mother, Helen, let me know that she had a wonderful Christmas with her family and was able to attend a New Millennium New Year's Eve celebration, complete with the 60's rock music she loved. Just as she did throughout her life, even in her most difficult days, Jo-Ann kept on doing the things that she loved—and she moved forward in so many remarkable efforts driven by a real sense of social conscience.

Mr. President, today I remember Jo-Ann for her service, her friendship, and her kindness. All of us who knew her continue to draw strength from her courage and her faith, and Jo-Ann's life continues to inspire.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3709. An act to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2412. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 5:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 701. An act to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 701. An act to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4386. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BURNS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 2521) making appropriations for military con-

struction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purpose (Rept No. 106-290).

By Mr. MCCONNELL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purpose (Rept. No. 106-291).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Donald W. Horton, of Maryland, to be United States Marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of four years.

E. Douglas Hamilton, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Phyllis J. Hamilton, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Donnie R. Marshall, of Texas, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

Nicholas G. Garaufis, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Gerard E. Lynch, of New York, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Steven S. Reed, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Roger L. Hunt, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Kent J. Dawson, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Jose Antonio Perez, of California, to be United States Marshal for the Central District of California for the term of four years.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-8926. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Suggested Changes to the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor's Statutory Audit Requirements"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-8927. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imported Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas" (Docket # 00-007-1), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8928. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imported

Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas and Treatment Dosage" (Docket # 99-078-2), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8929. A communication from the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Pay-As-You-Go Calculations, Report Number 505, dated May 2, 2000; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-8930. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Regulation: To Amend the EPA Acquisition Regulation Clause 1552.216-70, Award Fee" (FRL # 6606-6), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8931. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6606-3), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8932. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6602-7), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "36 CFR Part 51 Concession Contracts, Final Rule", received May 4, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2542. A bill to protect individuals, families, and ISPs from unsolicited and unwanted e-mail; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement of study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information

technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. Res. 305. A resolution commending participant in the Million Mom March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 306. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 307. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Con. Res. 112. A concurrent resolution to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 434.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

AMENDMENT TO STAFFORD ACT TO COVER AIRLINE AND RAIL ACCIDENTS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. Senator Stafford, my Vermont colleague

whose seat in this body I am honored to hold today, authored the legislation creating FEMA more than 25 years ago. Thanks to his foresight and leadership in this area, the federal government has helped thousands of ordinary citizens recover from disasters and other incidents beyond their control.

Today we have a chance to build on the legacy of Senator Stafford by adding airline and rail accidents to the list of "major disasters" defined in the act that governs the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

While extremely rare occurrences, major airline and rail disasters place an incredible burden on the states and municipalities in which they occur. Due in part to the extraordinary level of national attention these accidents receive, states and municipalities face millions of dollars in unexpected and unbudgeted expenditures that often cripple local finances. Fees associated with initial response, security, and other health and safety measures often cost several million dollars.

This legislation standardizes procedure for federal reimbursement of affected communities. While the federal government has regularly reimbursed states and municipalities during the 1990s for their role in these most national of disasters, the process is an ad hoc one. This body has considered and approved at least three special line item appropriations for areas affected by the recent ValueJet, TWA, and COMAIR accidents. A bill to reimburse Rhode Island for its costs associated with last fall's Egypt Air disaster is currently working its way through the Congress as part of the appropriation for the National Transportation Safety Board.

This process causes needless headache and anxiety for local communities, as well as unnecessary chores for the NTSB and Congress. It forces states and municipalities to wait as reimbursement requests find their way through the complicated appropriations process while creating more work for our overburdened appropriators.

The numbers speak for themselves. States and local communities spend millions of dollars to respond to these accidents. While they are ultimately reimbursed by the federal government, the uncertainty and slow pace of the process often places affected communities in a financial bind. Money that could be spent on education, health care, or public safety is lost in an unnecessary limbo.

Under this bill, airline and rail accidents will be treated like any other disaster under the Stafford Act. Like an earthquake, blizzard or any other disaster, FEMA, upon the request of a governor, will examine the scene of such an accident and advise the President on whether federal reimbursement is appropriate.

Mr. President, this bill simply standardizes procedure for a commitment already made by the federal government. It requires to new costs or expenses

and actually saves money by streamlining a bureaucratic and complicated process. The International Association of Emergency Managers and the NTSB supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join these groups in supporting this bill that will bring standardization to an ad hoc process that has the potential to cause so much harm to our states and communities.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CHILDREN OF WOMEN VIETNAM VETERANS'
BENEFITS ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY, I wish to introduce a bill, the Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which would amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children born with certain birth defects to women Vietnam veterans.

This bill is essentially similar, except for minor technical corrections, to S. 2494, the Children of Female Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which I introduced on May 2, 2000. Mrs. MURRAY had asked to be an original cosponsor of that bill, but through an inadvertent clerical error, she was not listed as an original cosponsor on the bill when it was printed. I wish to note, for the record, that it was her intent to be an original cosponsor of S. 2494.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2544

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR THE CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS WHO SUFFER FROM CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

"§ 1811. Definitions

"In this subchapter:

"(1) The term 'child', with respect to a female Vietnam veteran, means a natural child of the female Vietnam veteran, regardless of age or marital status, who was conceived after the date on which the female Vietnam veteran first entered the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title).

"(2) The term 'covered birth defect' means each birth defect identified by the Secretary under section 1812 of this title.

"(3) The term 'female Vietnam veteran' means any female individual who performed active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as so specified), without regard to the characterization of the individual's service.

"§ 1812. Birth defects covered

"(a) IDENTIFICATION.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall identify the birth defects of children of female Vietnam veterans that—

"(1) are associated with the service of female Vietnam veterans in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title); and

"(2) result in the permanent physical or mental disability of such children.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include birth defects resulting from the following:

"(A) A familial disorder.

"(B) A birth-related injury.

"(C) A fetal or neonatal infirmity with well-established causes.

"(2) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include spina bifida.

"(c) LIST.—The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations a list of the birth defects identified under subsection (a).

"§ 1813. Benefits and assistance

"(a) HEALTH CARE.—(1) The Secretary shall provide a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by the child for such birth defect or any disability that is associated with such birth defect.

"(2) The Secretary may provide health care under this subsection directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the definitions in section 1803(c) of this title shall apply with respect to the provision of health care under this subsection, except that for such purposes—

"(A) the reference to 'specialized spina bifida clinic' in paragraph (2) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to a specialized clinic treating the birth defect concerned under this subsection; and

"(B) the reference to 'vocational training under section 1804 of this title' in paragraph (8) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to vocational training under subsection (b).

"(b) VOCATIONAL TRAINING.—(1) The Secretary may provide a program of vocational training to a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect if the Secretary determines that the achievement of a vocational goal by the child is reasonably feasible.

"(2) Subsections (b) through (e) of section 1804 of this title shall apply with respect to any program of vocational training provided under paragraph (1).

"(c) MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—(1) The Secretary shall pay a monthly allowance to any child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect for any disability resulting from such birth defect.

"(2) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be based on the degree of disability suffered by the child concerned, as determined in accordance with a schedule for rating disabilities resulting from covered birth defects that is prescribed by the Secretary.

"(3) In prescribing a schedule for rating disabilities under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish four levels of disability upon which the amount of the monthly allowance under this subsection shall be based.

"(4) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be as follows:

"(A) In the case of a child suffering from the lowest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, \$100.

"(B) In the case of a child suffering from the lower intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$214; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the lowest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(C) In the case of a child suffering from the higher intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$743; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the intermediate level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(D) In the case of a child suffering from the highest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$1,272; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the highest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(5) Amounts under subparagraphs (A), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (4) shall be subject to adjustment from time to time under section 5312 of this title.

"(6) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 1805 of this title shall apply with respect to any monthly allowance paid under this subsection.

"(d) GENERAL LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE.—(1) No individual receiving benefits or assistance under this section may receive any benefits or assistance under subchapter I of this chapter.

"(2) In any case where affirmative evidence establishes that the covered birth defect of a child results from a cause other than the active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam of the female Vietnam veteran who is the mother of the child, no benefits or assistance may be provided the child under this section.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this section."

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—That chapter is further amended by inserting after subchapter II, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

"§ 1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions

"The provisions of sections 5101(c), 5110(a), (b)(2), (g), and (i), 5111, and 5112(a), (b)(1), (b)(6), (b)(9), and (b)(10) of this title shall apply with respect to benefits and assistance under this chapter in the same manner as such provisions apply to veterans' disability compensation.

"§ 1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of the individual to receive any other benefit to which the individual is otherwise entitled under any law administered by the Secretary.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of any other individual to receive any

benefit to which such other individual is entitled under any law administered by the Secretary based on the relationship of such other individual to the individual who receives such monetary allowance.

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a monetary allowance paid an individual under this chapter shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for or the amount of benefits under any Federal or Federally-assisted program.”.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED MATTER.—Section 1806 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(d) REDESIGNATION OF EXISTING MATTER.—Chapter 18 of that title is further amended by inserting before section 1801 the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Sections 1801 and 1802 of that title are each amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this subchapter”.

(2) Section 1805(a) of such title is amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this section”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1)(A) The chapter heading of chapter 18 of that title is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 18—BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS”.

(B) The tables of chapters at beginning of that title, and at the beginning of part II of that title, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 18 and inserting the following new item:

“18. Benefits for Children of Vietnam Veterans 1801”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 18 of that title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the chapter heading the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”;

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1806; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

“1811. Definitions.

“1812. Birth defects covered.

“1813. Benefits and assistance.

“SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

“1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions.

“1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits.”.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall identify birth defects under section 1822 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), and shall prescribe the regulations required by subchapter II of that title (as so added), not later than the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(3) No benefit or assistance may be provided under subchapter II of chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), for any period before the effective date specified in paragraph (1) by reason of the amendments made by this section.●

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement to study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT ACT

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to increase the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation from the current \$61 million to \$81 million. I am pleased to have the support and able assistance of the Senior Senator from Nebraska, Senator J. ROBERT KERREY in joining me to introduce this bill. This increase allows the Foundation to add another 100 young people to the 300 that they now support. This substantial increase will augment the influence the Foundation already has on American higher education.

Goldwater scholarships are awarded to college juniors and seniors in math and science. The increased funding in this legislation is set aside for information technology students. Channeling these funds through the existing Goldwater framework will maximize the amount of money directly available to students. These students are selected on the basis of academic merit from a field of approximately 1,200 mathematics, science and engineering students nominated by the faculties of colleges and universities from the fifty states and Puerto Rico. Since 1988, 2,711 scholarships have been awarded, providing about \$28 million to outstanding scholars from colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Goldwater Scholars are top notch. As evidence, I cite the large number of Goldwater Scholars who have been awarded prestigious graduate scholarships. Goldwater Scholars have won a total of 25 Rhodes Scholarships over the years. Last year alone, almost 20 percent of the awards—six out of 32—were Goldwater Scholars. Goldwater Scholars also populate the ranks of other distinguished fellowships. In the last eleven years, the scholars have won 19 Marshall, six Churchill, nine Fulbright, 23 Hughes, and 65 National Science Foundation fellowships.

These are the students we need in our economy. For the U.S. to continue to be competitive and support our growing economy, we must encourage our young men and women to enter the high technology industry. America's explosive demand for highly skilled workers is creating a new labor shortage. Under current conditions, we do not have enough U.S. workers trained in high technology fields. This forces our local businesses to resort to immigration to make up for this shortfall. Highly skilled immigrants enter the country under the H1-B visa waiver program. To help meet the growing demand, Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 in FY 1999 and 2000, and 107,500 in 2001. Unfortu-

nately, even this increase is not enough. A tight labor market, increasing globalization and burgeoning economic growth continue to increase U.S. demands for highly skilled workers. The 1999 cap on H1-B visas was reached in June of last year and it is projected we will reach the cap even earlier this year. Later this month, we expect the Senate to consider another increase of H1-B visas to raise the cap to 195,000 a year for FY 2000, 2001 and 2002.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I firmly believe that we have the responsibility to adequately train our own labor force to meet the business and industry demands of today and tomorrow. We simply cannot rely on workers from other countries to do our sensitive technology work. As we saw in the Y2K reprogram with our great dependence on foreign security workers, we are sorely in need of a domestic technology workforce.

Mr. President, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this effort to expand the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation and renew our commitment to educating young people in the fields of math and science. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2545

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS UNDER BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR STUDY RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—Section 1405(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (title XIV of Public Law 99-661; 20 U.S.C. 4704(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by striking “science and mathematics” and inserting “science, mathematics, and information technology and information protection technology”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “mathematics and the natural sciences” and inserting “mathematics, the natural sciences, and information technology and information protection technology”.

(b) FUNDING.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2001, \$20,000,000 for deposit in the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Fund established by section 1408(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (20 U.S.C. 4707(a)).

(2) Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) in the Fund referred to in that paragraph shall be available for purposes of providing scholarships and fellowships under section 1405(a) of that Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, for persons pursuing study in the field of information technology and information protection technology.●

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, in today's information age, the threat of electronic attack is more likely than a

nuclear attack. Words such as "cyber-terrorism" and "hackers" have crept into everyday talk, no longer confined to the world of computer nerds and geeks. Despite being one of the most technologically-advanced countries in the world, United States technology is not capable of keeping intruders out and secrets in. Flaws have been found in the computer systems of the Pentagon, IRS, bank networks, utility companies, and telecommunications providers, among others, making all of them vulnerable to attack.

The question, then, is what can we do as a country to protect both the government and industries from electronic attack? I believe we need to start early to equip more people with technological skills needed to build and maintain secure information technology networks. Today, along with my good friend Senator ROBERTS from Kansas, I am pleased to be introducing legislation that will do just that.

The vehicle we use to achieve this is the highly reputable Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, which currently awards scholarships to college juniors and seniors studying math and science. I doubt any of my colleagues would dispute the vast success of the Goldwater foundation. Nearly 20 percent of last year's Rhodes Scholars were Goldwater Scholars first; and in the last eleven years, Goldwater Scholars have won 19 Marshall, 6 Churchill, 9 Fulbright, 23 Hughes, 65 NSF and numerous other fellowships.

Our bill is simple: We increase funding for the Goldwater foundation by 20 million dollars, taking it from 61 to 81 million dollars. That money will go for scholarships to a new category of students, those studying "information protection technology". By training these young people, we can set up our technological infrastructure so it becomes safe from intruders.

Let me paint you a picture. Fifty years ago we suffered a devastating attack on Pearl Harbor. The siege lasted five hours. 2403 lives were lost, as were twenty ships and 188 aircraft. That attack catapulted the United States into World War II. As a country, however, we emerged from the war more powerful than we had been entering it. Along with the Soviet Union, the U.S. was deemed a "superpower," and we have yet to give up that title.

A devastating attack today would take a much different form and have much more catastrophic consequences. We are not likely to be attacked by airplanes and ships. Rather, it is far more likely that we will be attacked through our technology systems. The attack can occur in as little as ten seconds, and the effects can devastate our whole industrial and governmental infrastructure. A cyber-terrorist can wipe out all financial records, plunge aircraft from the air with no warning, corrupt our entire national defense system, and render telecommunications useless. And it can happen in just sec-

onds, virtually undetected. And we were worried about Y2K.

If this scenario frightens you, good. These threats are very real, and with our growing dependence on informational systems, as a country we become more vulnerable every day. One needs to look no further than the now infamous "I love you" computer virus that swept this world last week to get a glimpse at how quickly this can occur, and how devastating such an attack can be.

The Pentagon, other government agencies, and many industries have set up departments to handle cyber-security, but we need to do everything we can to ensure that these departments can be staffed by knowledgeable information-protection experts. Without skilled staff, these departments are useless. The Information Protection Technology Scholarships will help ensure that the students in college have the opportunity to learn as much as possible about protecting technology. In turn, these students will repay the nation by putting their skills to work to make our technological infrastructure more secure. Twenty million dollars is not much to ask for to protect the entire United States from the possibility of wide-ranging cyber-terrorism.

One final note. With such a shortage of qualified American workers, America's high tech industry is hiring people from other countries to come to the United States and fill these jobs. Highly trained immigrants enter this country under the H1-B visa program. Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 for FY '99, and it wasn't enough: we reached that cap by June last year. Later this month, the Senate is expected to consider another increase of H1-B visas to 195,000 per year for FY00, 01 and 02. I support this proposed increase; however, I firmly believe we must do everything in our power to grow our own labor force. That is why I intend to offer this bill as an amendment to S. 2045 when it is considered on the Senate floor.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environmental and Public Works.

CLEAN AIR AND WATER PRESERVATION ACT OF
2000

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to introduce the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 with my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN. Our bill will accomplish the following: 1. Phases down to elimination MTBE within 3 years of enact-

ment; 2. Maintains the oxygenate standard; 3. Probably has the strongest environmental anti-backsliding provisions of any bill; 4. A temporary waiver from oxygenate standard could be granted if the USDA and DOE certify that there is an issue with supply; and 5. Highway apportionment percentages will stay the same.

Low grain prices high fuel prices, and the clean water problems associated with MTBE have highlighted the need for this bipartisan effort to protect our water, protect our air, and to protect our rural economy. Our region and the nation require a renewable, environmentally friendly alternative to MTBE that helps create local jobs, which adds value to our farmer's product, which moves us away from an energy-hostage situation where our reliance on foreign-produced oil makes our producers, consumers and economy subject to the whims of international cartel autocrats, and protects our air and water.

My colleagues and friends on this issue, Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR, have also introduced a bill on this issue. I commend them for their involvement and look forward to working with them; however, I do not believe their bill solves all the problems. Specifically, their bill eliminates the oxygenate requirement.

The federal oxygen-content requirement was adopted for several reasons. First, Congress understood that oxygenates provide a source of clean octane-displacing toxic compounds such as benzene and reducing ozone-forming exhaust emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. Second, Congress recognized the energy-security benefits of substituting a certain percentage of imported petroleum with domestically-produced, renewable fuels such as ethanol. Finally, the Congress hoped the Federal oxygen requirement could provide new market opportunities for farmers by stimulating new demand for ethanol. I believe each of these objectives remain as valid today as they were in 1990.

Unfortunately, the refiners' decision to utilize MTBE, rather than ethanol, has created a serious and growing problem nationwide. The U.S. Geological Survey reports that MTBE has been detected in 21 percent of the drinking water wells in RFG areas nationwide. States with detected MTBE water contamination include Missouri, Illinois, California, Texas, Virginia, Florida, Connecticut, and many more.

It is important to recognize that the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 did not mandate the use of MTBE. Indeed, in Chicago and other areas where ethanol RFG is used, the program has been declared a huge air quality success. Replicating the Chicago ethanol RFG model in areas where MTBE is being used today would assure continued air quality progress without compromising water quality by its use. It would also provide a tremendous economic stimulus to rural America by creating value-added demand for as

much as 500 million bushels of grain. The Department of Agriculture recently reported that replacing MTBE with ethanol in RFG markets would increase net farm income \$1 billion annually, create 13,000 new jobs, enhance our balance of trade and reduce farm program costs over the next ten years. Moreover, USDA reports ethanol can replace MTBE without price spikes or shortages in supplies within three years.

Let us be very clear about this issue. The environmental problem at hand is real. However, the problem is not ethanol, the problem is MTBE.

Fortunately some States are already taking action to ban MTBE. Some are not moving fast enough. We need to make certain that all States ban MTBE to eliminate its contamination of our water supplies. To ensure that we do not have a piecemeal approach to banning MTBE it is important to pass legislation to ensure we have a national solution.

This bill is supported by the National Corn Growers, Missouri Corn Growers, Renewable Fuels Association, and the Missouri Farm Bureau. I look forward to other groups supporting this bill as well.

I am pleased that Senator DURBIN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ASHCROFT have joined me in introducing this vitally important bill. I look forward to working with them and all the other members that join us in this endeavor to ensure that we have a national solution that will protect our water and still ensure that we maintain our air quality benefits produced from the Federal oxygenate requirement. In addition, we will be promoting positive energy and rural economic policy objectives, which includes ethanol.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, in introducing the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000, a bill that will ban the gasoline additive MTBE and promote the use of renewable ethanol fuel.

By now, many of us are aware of the dangers methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) poses to our environment, our water supply, and our communities. Although this additive has only been widely used for about five years, it is now one of the most frequently detected volatile organic chemicals in drinking water supplies across the nation. In fact, MTBE contamination has affected communities in my home state of Illinois raising many public health concerns.

This legislation addresses these problems by banning MTBE within three years and urging refiners to replace it with ethanol. The bill also increases consumer protection by requiring gasoline stations to label pumps that still sell MTBE. And the Environmental Protection Agency is directed to assist states in getting the chemical out of their groundwater.

Furthermore, the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 includes

strict anti-backsliding provisions to ensure we do not lose the air quality benefits that we have already achieved. Protection from toxic chemicals and environmentally sound emission levels will not be compromised.

Most important, this legislation upholds the air quality benefits of the reformulated gasoline (RFG) program by maintaining the oxygenate standard. Adding oxygen to our gasoline has helped clean the air in many cities across the nation. With the use of ethanol, the Chicago RFG program has proven highly successful in improving the air quality in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

I am proud to say that Illinois is the nation's largest ethanol producer and that one in every six rows of Illinois corn—280 million bushels—goes to ethanol production. But, an expanded role for this renewable fuel is more than a boost to industry; it is jobs to rural America, and it is energy security. As we look for solutions to high oil prices, we must remember that ethanol is a viable alternative fuel—domestically produced and environmentally friendly. In fact, every 23 gallons of ethanol displaces a barrel of foreign oil.

I commend the Clinton administration and Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR for their efforts aimed at solving the problems associated with MTBE and opening a dialogue on renewable fuel content standards. However, I strongly feel we need to maintain our commitment to preserving the oxygenate standard, which has proven to be integral to achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 is good for our environment and public health and a boost for rural economies. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN, as an original cosponsor to the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000. I commend them for their leadership in resolving a very real problem—not a phony problem.

The real problem is that MTBE is contaminating our Nation's water supplies.

The phony problem is the proposition that the Clean Air Act's oxygenate standard caused the MTBE water contamination.

Unfortunately, powerful, influential forces are trying to sucker Congress and the American public into embracing the phony problem.

Some propagandists of the phony problem may be motivated by greed. After all, if the petroleum industry gets its way, its profits will balloon. If they can get Congress or the administration to grant waivers of the oxygenate standard, big oil will be able to squeeze out the 3 to 4 percent of the market currently supplied by alternatives.

The Department of Energy has determined that even a small amount of al-

ternative fuels can save consumers billions of dollars each year by leveraging lower gasoline prices.

Petroleum companies also tell us that they can produce a gasoline just as clean for the air, but without oxygenates. Of course, they tell you that it will come at some extra cost.

Mr. President, I must ask my colleagues: Do we really need to give the petroleum industry both the ability and the excuse to jack up gasoline prices and further gouge American consumers?

Of course not. And the way to make certain this does not happen is by enacting the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000.

Other propagandists of the phony problem may be political opportunists seeking to engage in some self-serving election-year shenanigans.

The Clinton administration is facing a tough political dilemma. Chevron and other petroleum interests have convinced California's Governor that the only solution to the MTBE problem is to waive the oxygenate requirement.

California represents enormous political stakes for November's elections. Understandably, the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to California.

But the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to America's farmers. If the administration gives California and other states a waiver from the oxygenate standard, they will have single-handedly destroyed a \$1 billion per year market for America's farmers.

So, what's the easy political solution? Simple. Throw the hot-potato into the laps of Congress. Hold a press conference laying out quote, end-quote, legislative principles for solving the MTBE problem.

By dumping this on Congress, the administration does not have to make the tough decisions, and will be in a position to second-guess and attack anything and everything Congress does do to try to work this out.

And the irony of all of this, is that had the Clinton administration followed Congressional intent about the Clean Air Act Reformulated Fuels Program, instead of listening to the oil companies and some misguided environmentalists, other oxygenates such as ethanol could have competed with MTBE, and we would have far less MTBE water contamination today.

The Clinton administration was warned loud and clear about the health and environmental problems of MTBE. I personally sent many letters and made a lengthy floor statement in 1993 warning then about MTBE and urging that they not give Big Oil a regulation guaranteeing them a market monopoly over the oxygenated problem.

Anyone who has ever smelled MTBE, knows that had consumers been given a choice, they would have overwhelmingly chose to buy reformulated fuel made with ethanol, not MTBE.

So the Clinton administration created this MTBE problem in the first

place, and now they tell the world that the only way to correct it is for Congress to fix it.

That's just not true. But the truth sort of got lost during the administration's press conference by EPA's Carol Browner. She forgot to tell the American public the truth that each and every State has the authority to protect its water supplies from MTBE contamination. As long as the States pass laws designed to protect the water, as opposed to protecting the air, the Clean Air Act does not legally preempt the States from taking action on their own.

And I received assurances from EPA during a recent hearing that they would never attempt to stop a State from protecting water supplies from MTBE contamination.

Now, some would argue that the oil industry would try to challenge such efforts in court.

Mr. President, that proposition is ridiculous. The oil companies chose to use MTBE instead of ethanol. They are now liable for what could be billions of dollars of MTBE clean up costs. And these liability costs mount with every day that passes, that the oil companies refuse to replace MTBE with other oxygenates.

Therefore, who in their right mind could think that the oil companies are stupid enough to take court action to block a State from banning the use of MTBE?

So, why didn't EPA's Carol Browner announce to the world the States already have the authority to ban MTBE—the source of the real problem?

Well, if the administration admits the truth, and if they fail to convince Americans and Congress that only Congress can fix this problem, then the Clinton administration is stuck back at "square one" having to choose between California or America's farmers who have suffered the lowest prices in decades.

Mr. President, there are others pushing the phony problem who may simply be struggling to save face, hoping that they not suffer the embarrassment of being proven wrong—wrong in their efforts to help petroleum interests in securing a Clinton administration regulation guaranteeing that MTBE would monopolize the oxygenate market.

These environmentalists would like the public to believe that ethanol was never really a viable option—not then, not now. If they ever concede that point, then it will be clear to Americans that these environmentalists were key promoters of what has turned out to be one of the biggest environmental crises ever to face America.

Mr. President, there are some environmentalists who do not like ethanol, simply because it is something that can be made by farmers. They don't like farmers because sometimes they have to use fertilizers and chemicals. It is that simple-minded.

Mr. President, the real problem is MTBE, and the real solution to this

problem is passing the bill introduced today by our colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN.

I warn my colleagues, however, that if they buy into the phony problem, they will end up having to buy into phony solutions.

For instance, the Clinton administration suggested that Congress might want to only reduce the amount of MTBE used, as opposed to banning it altogether. Well, that's a phony solution.

No level of MTBE in gasoline can protect our water supply.

My State of Iowa is facing an MTBE water contamination disaster. First, understand, we sell no Clean Air Act reformulated gasoline in Iowa. Second, understand that for years now, no gasoline was supposed to be sold in Iowa that contained more than 1 percent MTBE unless warning labels were posted.

Nevertheless, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources recently found that 29 percent of Iowa's water supplies tested contained MTBE above the acceptable levels established by EPA.

So what does this mean? Simply this: MTBE is used in conventional fuel as an octane enhancer and will contaminate your water.

If a State is allowed to waive out of the oxygenate requirement, MTBE will still be used and will continue to contaminate our water supplies.

It is phony to argue the oxygenate requirement is the problem, and it is phony to argue waiving or eliminating the oxygenate requirement will protect our water supplies.

Mr. President, this is just one of many phony issues that we are being asked to embrace. I will be speaking further about this at a later time.

But in closing, I ask my colleagues to cosponsor our legislation. It provides real solutions to the real problem: MTBE water contamination.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GREAT SAND DUNES NATIONAL PARK ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to establish the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve.

This legislation is a major step in protection and preservation of the Great Sand Dunes and San Luis Valley water. I along with Congressman McINNIS decided to introduce companion bills at the request of valley residents, locally elected officials and the Rio Grande Water Conservation District. In an era of Presidential threats and questionable uses of the Antiquities Act, a locally driven legislative process is something I strongly support.

Anyone who has visited the Sand Dunes understands the unique feeling they offer the visitor, the dunes seem out of place—a contradiction in nature. The San Luis Valley serenely placed between the Sangre De Cristo and the San Juan Mountains is the last place one would expect to see 750 foot high sand dunes. Still, the Sand Dunes offered the early residents and explorers a unique look into the earth's geological wonders. This bill will help to ensure that future generations have that same opportunity.

Developing legislation that satisfies everyone is a difficult task, but this bill reflects compromises on all sides and puts forth a unique proposal for a complicated issue. The provisions of the bill allow for (1) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Park; (2) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (3) the acquisition of the Luis Maria Baca Grant No. 4; (4) protection of San Luis Valley's water resources; (5) hunting in the new Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (6) creation of a new National Wildlife Refuge and (7) a local advisory council.

Protection of the valley's water resources is very important to the citizens of Colorado and a primary motivation for virtually everyone's support for this measure. An integral part of the water component is the federal acquisition of the Baca Ranch. While I am usually very skeptical of additional federal ownership of land, it makes sense here to purchase the land from willing sellers and incorporate it into the combination park, wildlife refuge and forest. The legislation requires the Department of the Interior to work with the State of Colorado to protect the water dependent resources of the Sand Dunes while not jeopardizing valid existing water rights held by others. I want to assure everyone that this bill does not create a federal reserve water right.

The Great Sand Dunes National Preserve allows the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to transfer existing Forest Service lands to the Park Service and manage these lands as a Preserve. The transfer would allow the Park Service jurisdiction of the watershed affecting the Sand Dunes, while not affecting the wilderness status or existing hunting in the area. As a veterinarian I understand and recognize hunting as an important tool in game management. The bill stipulates that the Colorado Division of Wildlife will play an integral role in continued game management of the area.

The bill also creates a new National Wildlife Refuge on the western edge of the existing Baca Ranch and adjacent state trust lands. This new Refuge will provide additional hunting opportunities in an area that has been historically closed to public hunting. It has extensive wetlands and is home to an extensive diversity of plants and animals, including a large elk herd. The Refuge would also give the affected county an additional source of revenue

through the Refuge and Revenue Sharing Act as an offset to the loss of property taxes from the federal acquisition of the Baca.

President Herbert Hoover in 1932 recognized the unique characteristics of the sand dunes and wanted to protect their scenic, scientific and educational features. With the support of the local community, the Great Sand Dunes National Monument was established. Now sixty-eight years later, residents of the San Luis Valley are advocating expansion and upgrade of the national monument to a national park.

Last December, I along with Senator CAMPBELL, Congressman MCINNIS, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and Colorado Attorney General Ken Salazar met at the Great Sand Dunes to discuss the merits of expanding and protecting the resources of the San Luis Valley. We all recognized the significance of the meeting and vowed to work towards passage of a bill.

Our time is short in Congress this year, and soon I will be asking for a hearing in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This is an important issue to Coloradans, and I look forward to Senate passage of my legislation.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SECURING HEIGHTENED OPPORTUNITIES FOR WORKERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND AGRICULTURE EXPORTERS ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I want to discuss an issue that, judging from my discussions with Missourians, establishing the right trade policy with China is of increasing concern to Americans, and Missourians in particular.

Missourians want more opportunities to use their economic freedom to shape the future for their families. They want increasing opportunities to sell their products. They want reciprocity and fairness. This is why I want to ensure that Missouri businesses, farmers, and workers will get what they are promised. Access to a market that is almost one-fourth of the world's population can create higher paying jobs. But if China doesn't live up to its agreements like in the past—no new jobs will be created in Missouri.

The WTO agreement that the United States concluded with China last November could give Missourians substantial benefits. Tariffs on industrial goods could fall from 25 to 9 percent—this means that all of the parts manufacturers for aerospace, automobiles, appliances would all face substantial “tax decrease.” Also, tariffs on agricultural goods would be reduced from 31 to 17 percent. Missouri, as a leader in agricultural production,

would benefit substantially from these reductions. Cattlemen and pork producers would experience significant gains when tariffs are dropped to 12 percent. I also want Missouri farmers to have direct access to Chinese consumers instead of having to go through a bunch of middle-men. In addition, China has made commitments to eliminate eventually many of its current restrictions on services, such as distribution, banking, insurance, telecommunications, accounting, consulting, and other financial services.

But these are the promises that are on paper. Missourians in the “Show-Me” state are leery of relying only on promises when they don't know whether there is adequate enforcement. I've visited many factories where the workers want to make sure that they get a fair shake. They want real opportunities. They don't want hollow promises. I've been all over the state visiting farm families, and this is what they want as well.

Several of my constituents have a fairly accurate perspective on China's record of not voluntarily living up to its agreements. Let me read from a constituent letter, from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District 9, Bridge-ton, Mo., dated March 17, 2000:

China has a history of failing to live up to every other trade agreement it has signed with the United States (the 1992 Memorandum on Prison Labor, the 1996 Bilateral Agreement on Unilateral Property Rights, the 1994 Bilateral Agreement on Textiles, and the 1992 memorandum of Understanding on Market Access).

I think this constituent has a pretty accurate assessment of China's dismal trade record. Quite honestly, China's trade record has been poor. In a 1992 agreement, the so-called “Market Access” Agreement, Missouri farmers, ranchers, and workers weren't actually given much market access. In 1995 China eliminated 176 licensing requirements, but then imposed 400 new de facto licensing requirements. By 1999, China had removed over 1,000 quotas and licenses, but the U.S. Trade Representative reports that China is erecting new barriers to restrict imports. Also, despite the commitment not to require import substitution, China announced a new “Industrial Policy for the 1990s” which could undermine the U.S. automobile, telecommunications, transportation, machinery, electronics, and construction industries.

Another one of my constituents has additional concerns that once we approve PNTR, the U.S. will lose substantial leverage. From the International Association of Fire Fighters of Kansas City, Mo, Local Union No. 42, dated March 28, 2000:

Granting PNTR will . . . reduce our ability to use unilateral tools to respond to continued Chinese failure to live up to its commitments. Our ability to take unilateral action is our only leverage against the Chinese government. Proponents of PNTR admit that only by using unilateral actions we were able to make even modest progress on intellec-

tual property rights. The Chinese government has not lived up to the promises they made in every single trade agreement signed with the U.S. in the past ten years.

This Missourian is absolutely correct. In 1994 when we negotiated the WTO, the United States gave up the right to threaten a level of retaliation that was “appropriate in the circumstances” to get compliance. However, now we are bound to retaliate at a level that the WTO decides. We have seen where this has taken us with exporting our beef to Europe—absolutely nowhere.

We need to avoid creating an endless lawsuit with China that gets us nowhere. Missourians want some guarantees that they will in fact get export opportunities and not just a lot of litigation with no real results as with the Europeans in the beef and banana cases, where the retaliation level was reduced by the WTO body.

My goal is consistent with the “show me” state. It is straight-forward. Open China's market to Missouri goods and services. In order to do that, however, we must have enforcement that works. That is why I am proposing the “SHOW ME” Act.

My bill is simple. It would require the Administration to work out an arrangement with China whereby if the U.S. wins a WTO case but can't get compliance, China would agree not to challenge the U.S. level of retaliation. The Administration could negotiate this concession from China as a side letter to the November agreement or could negotiate as a part of the protocol of the accession phase.

There is precedent for this requirement. The Administration negotiated a 12 to 15 year phase out of special rules for safeguards and anti-dumping and countervailing duties (which are tools to protect our market), yet they did not work out a 15 year phase out of use of Section 301 (which is a foreign market opening tool). Both are needed—surge protection and market access tools. Market access is crucial to the farming community in Missouri, which gets about one-fourth of its farm income from overseas sales.

In closing, Mr. President, quite frankly, there is declining satisfaction in America's heartland with our inability to pry open foreign markets. The only way we will rebuild is with real enforcement. A lot of my constituents from the “Show Me” state want to see more assurances from us and the Administration that what happened on the EU beef and banana cases won't reverberate through the Chinese market. They want our trade policy to create jobs in practice, not just in theory.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more

effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for analysis of major rules, to promote the public's right to know the costs and benefits of major rules, and to increase the accountability of quality of Government.

S. 779

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 779, a bill to provide that no Federal income tax shall be imposed on amounts received by Holocaust victims or their heirs.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, a bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as cosponsor of S. 1028, *supra*.

S. 1185

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1185, a bill to provide small business certain protections from litigation excesses and to limit the product liability of non-manufacturer product sellers.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1638

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, his name was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1638, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility data for financial assistance for higher education for spouses and dependent children of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty.

S. 1658

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1658, a bill to authorize the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1691, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize programs for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate an inequity on the applicability of early retirement eligibility requirements to military reserve technicians.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the Medicare program.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991.

S. 2044

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2044, a bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for domestic violence programs through the voluntary purchase of specially issued postage stamps.

S. 2046

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2046, a bill to reauthorize the Next Generation Internet Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

S. 2115

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2115, a bill to ensure adequate monitoring of the commitments made by the People's Republic of China in its accession to the World Trade Organization and to create new procedures to ensure compliance with those commitments.

S. 2218

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2218, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance is made available to Federal employees and annuitants and members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2311, a bill to revise and extend the Ryan White CARE Act programs under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, to improve access to health care and the quality of health care under such programs, and to provide for the development of increased capacity to provide health care and related support services to individuals and families with HIV disease, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to extend the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

S. 2397

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2397, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to deny Federal educational assistance funds to local educational agencies that deny the Department of Defense access to secondary school students or directory information about secondary school students for military purposes; and for other purposes.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2413

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2413, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests;

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2417, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase funding for State nonprofit source pollution control programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2420

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2420, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance is made available to Federal employees, members of the uniformed services, and civilian and military retirees, and other purposes.

S. 2459

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2459, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in

recognition of their service to the Nation.

S. 2477

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2477, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional safeguards for beneficiaries with representative payees under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program or the Supplemental Security Income program.

S. CON. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 60, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. Wisconsin and all those who served aboard her.

S. CON. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 100, a concurrent resolution expressing support of Congress for a National Moment of Remembrance to be observed at 3:00 p.m. eastern standard time on each Memorial Day.

S. CON. RES. 107

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 107, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning support for the Sixth Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference.

S. CON. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 109, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the ongoing persecution of 13 members of Iran's Jewish community.

S.J. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution supporting the Day of Honor 2000 to honor and recognize the service of minority veterans in the United States Armed Forces during World War II.

S. RES. 296

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Sen-

ator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 296, a resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each calendar year as "National Child's Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 112—TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 434

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 112(b)(1), insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States."

(2) In section 112(b)(2), insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States".

(3) In section 112(b)(3), strike "countries, subject" and insert "countries (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in 1 or more beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries), subject".

(4) In section 112(b)(5)(A), insert "apparel articles of" after "to the extent that".

(5) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) in clause (i), strike "in a CBTPA beneficiary country" and insert "in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries"; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) strike "cut in a CBTPA beneficiary country" and insert "cut in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries"; and

(ii) strike "assembled in such country" and insert "assembled in 1 or more such countries".

(6) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States."

(7) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading

5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States".

(8) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(iii)(I) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "United States, in an amount" and insert "United States (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are formed in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries), in an amount".

(9) In clause (v) of section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) strike "fibers, fabric, or yarn" each place it appears in the heading and the text and insert "fabrics or yarn";

(B) strike "fibers, fabric, and yarn" and insert "fabrics and yarn"; and

(C) insert "apparel articles of" after "to the extent that".

(10) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "entered" and insert "classifiable".

(11) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "(vii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—" and insert "(viii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—".

(12) Strike section 412(a)(2) and insert the following:

(2) in the flush paragraph at the end, by striking "and (G)" and inserting "(G), and (H) (to the extent described in section 507(6)(D))".

(13) In the article description for subheading 9902.51.13 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as added by section 502(a) of the bill, strike "of 64's and linen worsted wool count wool yarn".

(14) In section 505(d), insert "to the United States Customs Service" after "appropriate claim".

SENATE RESOLUTION 305—COM-MENDING PARTICIPANTS IN THE MILLION MOM MARCH

Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 305

Whereas, on Mother's Day—May 14, 2000—Americans from all walks of life will unite for the Million Mom March on the National Mall in Washington, DC and in communities across the country to call for meaningful, common sense gun policy, and these families, citizens, members of religious congregations, schools, community-based organizations, businesses, and political and cultural groups will join together as a local and national community to recognize the violence committed against our children from guns; and

Whereas, 4,223 young people ages 19 and under were killed by gunfire—one every two hours, nearly 12 young people every day—in the United States in 1997, and

Whereas, American children under 15 are 12 times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined, and

Whereas, the one year Anniversary of the Columbine High School tragedy passed on April 20, 2000, without any action by Congress on the reasonable gun safety measures that were sent to a House-Senate conference more than nine months ago, and

Whereas protecting our children from gun violence is a top priority for our families, communities and nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The organizers, sponsors and participants of the Million Mom March shall be welcomed to Washington and commended for rallying their communities to demand sensible gun safety legislation, and

(2) Congress should pass a conference report to accompany H.R. 1501, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act before the Memorial Day Recess, which includes the Lautenberg-Kerrey gun show loophole amendment and the other Senate-passed provisions designed to limit access to firearms by juveniles, convicted felons, and other persons prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 306—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. HELMS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 306

Whereas motherhood is a God-given right of women to bear and rear children;

Whereas, since 1914, the United States has officially observed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day to display public expression of love and reverence for all American mothers;

Whereas Mother's Day is recognized by the United States and many other countries in affirmation of the invaluable role mothers play in providing a family upbringing for children;

Whereas the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women integrates a derogatory sentiment toward motherhood as manifested in the Convention's January 3, 2000 Committee Report on Belarus specifically condemning symbols such as Mother's Day;

Whereas the Senate affirms its commitment that the United States should work with other nations to enhance the protection of the fundamental right of motherhood, including the condemnation of coercive population control programs where expectant mothers are forced to undergo abortions or sterilizations;

Whereas the Convention's agenda to promote abortion worldwide invades the laws of countries that hold a religious or moral belief that abortion is the destruction of innocent human life and that it subjects expectant mothers to physical and emotional trauma;

Whereas the Convention seeks to supplant the primary care and nurturing provided by stay-at-home mothers with institutionalized daycare facilities as advocated in the Convention's August 12, 1997 Committee Report on Slovenia, which stated that children cared for at home are deprived of "educational and social opportunities offered in formal daycare institutions"; and

Whereas more than a hundred United States-based family, religious, and educational organizations representing countless millions of Americans strongly oppose United States ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the tenets of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women are incompatible with the tradition and policy of the United States to uphold motherhood and to regard motherhood with the highest degree of honor and respect;

(2) the Convention would create negative perceptions toward motherhood; and

(3) the Senate should not give its advice and consent to ratification of the fundamentally flawed Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, mothers across America will be showered with love and appreciation this Sunday as an annual expression of love and gratitude for the selfless acts mothers make for their families every day. Sunday is one of the truly special days of the year. It is Mother's Day.

Americans have a tradition of honoring mothers, dating back to 1914, when the second Sunday of May was first recognized as "Mother's Day".

It is especially significant in this year 2000 because of the irony that a number of high-profile women in the Clinton Administration—and in Congress—are so vocally supportive of the so-called U.N. Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, which they call CEDAW—which rhymes with hee-haw.

In any case, the point is this, Mr. President, the radical feminists groups around the country have gone to extreme lengths with incessant declarations, shouting, and even rudely disrupting at least one congressional hearing in their futile efforts to convince American women that the CEDAW Treaty somehow protects the rights of women, which it absolutely would not do—even in the highly unlikely event that the Senate ever gives CEDAW a second glance.

The problem for the radical feminists is that the truth has been circulated across the land that the proposed treaty fails to offer increased opportunities for women. All the same, the radical feminists have tried to turn the proposed treaty into a feminist manifesto, and the militant women have fallen on their faces in the process.

Mr. President, one needs only to examine the reports of the various CEDAW committees, and it is clear that motherhood is not favorably viewed by the CEDAW advocates.

For instance, Mr. President, earlier this year, one such committee solemnly warned the nation Belarus that there was great "concern [over] the continuing prevalence of such [stereotypical] symbols as a Mother's Day." Now get that—"the continuing prevalence of such [stereotypical] symbols as a Mother's Day." The nation Armenia was lectured about the need to "combat the traditional stereotype of women in the noble role of mother."

Another CEDAW committee warned Slovenia that too many Slovenian mothers (that's right, too many mothers) were staying home (in the opinion of the CEDAW ladies) to raise their children. Think of that bad situation,

mothers staying home to raise their children. The CEDAW crowd also warned that because only 30 percent of children in Slovenia were in day-care centers, the other 70 percent were in grave danger of "miss[ing] out on educational and social opportunities offered in (the) formal day-care institutions." One can surmise they mean that all this is more important and more effective than motherhood in the home.

So, in spite of CEDAW's noisy advocates, Mr. President, the so-called Convention of Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women—and that is a jawbreaker within itself—has been left at the starting gate simply because this unwise proposed treaty was clearly negotiated by radical feminists with the intent of enshrining their radical anti-family agenda into international law.

That is why this CEDAW mishmash has been collecting dust in the Senate for 20 years. And when I say Senate, I mean the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was sent to the Senate by President Carter in 1980—since which the Democratic Party was in control of the Senate for 10 years. But the treaty is so obviously bad that the Democrats never brought it up for a vote, and if I have anything to do with it—and I think I do—it will never see the light of day on my watch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of more than 100 U.S. groups, representing countless millions of Americans who oppose the CEDAW, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVER 100 ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING
COUNTLESS MILLIONS WHO OPPOSE CEDAW

The Alliance of Catholic Women, Providence, RI.
VCY America, Milwaukee, WI.
Leola Area Right to Life, Forbes, ND.
Baby Humans Foundation, Cedar Park, TX.

The New Jersey Coalition for Marriage, Mendham, NJ.
Our Lady of the Rosary, Library, Louisville, KY.
Eutopia: A Lay Journal of Catholic Thought, Washington, DC.
Voice For Life, Springfield, MO.
Northwest Catholic Family.
Education Conference.
Concerned Roman, Catholics of America, Anaheim, CA.
Holy Innocents Reparation Committee, Anaheim, CA.
Corpus Christi Parish, East Sandwich, MA.
Men's Health America, Rockville, MD.
The Way, The Truth, The Life, Forestport, NY.

National Federation of Republican Assemblies, Simi Valley, CA.
John Paul II Institute of Christian Spirituality, Woodstock, VA.
The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Pro-Life Action League, Madison, WI.
Women for Faith & Family, St. Louis, MO.
Jesus House Ministries.
ABC Pregnancy Help Center, Pratt, KS.
Rock for Life of Columbus & Central Ohio, Columbus, OH.
The American Family Association of NY, Port Washington, NY.

The Crush—Birmingham, Oneonta, AL.
Concerned Women for America of NJ, Glen Rock, NJ.
Knights of Columbus St Raphael Council, #11884, Belmont, WI.
Eagle Forum, Washington, DC.
Expectant Mother Care, New York, NY.
Legal Center for the Defense of Life.
New York, NY, Illinois Right to Life Committee, Chicago, IL.
Catholic Citizens of Illinois, La Grange, IL.
CSRA Family Network, Augusta, GA.
Catholics for Just Choice, San Antonio, TX.
Voice For Life, Springfield, MO.
Catholic Alliance, Washington, DC.
The Society for the Promotion of Celtic Virtues, Brewster, NY.
Vision Youth Ministries, Inc., Knox, IN.
A Woman's Hope, Champaign, IL.
St. Joseph, Guardian of the Redeemer Chapter: TORCH of the East Bay, Walnut Creek, CA.
Life Coalition International, Melbourne, FL.
Roe No More Ministry.
Capitol Resource Institute, Sacramento, CA.
Family Action Council International, Fredericksburg, VA.
World Family Policy Center, Provo, UT.
Life Advocates, Houston, TX.
Population Research Institute, Front Royal, VA.
Guild of the Holy Spirit, Front Royal, VA.
Couple to Couple League International, Cincinnati, OH.
Coalitions for America.
Knights of Columbus Council #765, Cuba City, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #1386, Platteville, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #1762, Hudson, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #7370, Hazel Green, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #1080, Darlington, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #605, Beloit, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #839, LaCrosse, WI.
Knights of Columbus Council #1909, Highland, WI.
Villanovans for Life, Villanova, PA.
Rock For Life, Owings Mills, MD.
National Congress for Fathers and Children, Kansas.
Rockford Area RomanCatholic Home Educators, Capron, IL.
NFP Outreach, Oklahoma City, OK.
ABCs of Faith, The Woodlands, TX.
Rock For Life, Quad Cities Illinois.
Torch, Montgomery County.
New Jersey Physician's Resource Council, Mountainside, NJ.
Life Savers Ministries, Inc., Bakersfield, CA.
Rock for Life, Elkton, Maryland.
Rock For Life, Richmond, TX.
Rock For Life, Manchester, NH.
The National Right to Life Committee, Washington, DC.
TLM Youth Group, Cajon, CA.
Rockland County Catholic Coalition, Nyack, NY.
Rock For Life, Elgin, Illinois.
Rock For Life, Lane County, Oregon.
Upper Michigan Christians United, Ishpeming, MI.
New Hampshire ProLife Council, Manchester, NH.
The Family Foundation, Richmond, VA.
Rock For Life, Fort Wayne, IN.
St. Thomas More Society of Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, IN.
Notre Dame Right to Life, Notre Dame, IN.
Concerned Women for America, Washington, DC.

Praise Assembly of God, Wayne, NE.
Christ in the Workplace, Chicago, IL.
Save the Baby Humans Foundation, Cedar Park, TX.
Our Lady of the Rosary Library, Louisville, KY.
The New Jersey Family Policy Council, Parsippany, NJ.
The Family Foundation, Richmond, VA.
William and Mary Alternatives to Abortion, Williamsburg, VA.
Holy Family Medical Specialties, Lincoln, NE.
Rock for Life, McLean, VA.
United Families Int'l, Salt Lake City, UT.
Pro-Life Wisconsin, Brookfield, WI.
Catholic Pro-Life Committee of the Diocese of Dallas, Dallas, TX.
Cincinnati Rock For Life, Hamilton, OH.
Family Research Council, Washington, D.C.
The White Rose Women's Center, Dallas, TX.
Focus on the Family, Washington, D.C.

SENATE RESOLUTION 307—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. HELMS submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie over, under the rule:

S. RES. 307

Whereas motherhood is a God-given right of women to bear and rear children;

Whereas, since 1914, the United States has officially observed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day to display public expression of love and reverence for all American mothers;

Whereas Mother's Day is recognized by the United States and many other countries in affirmation of the invaluable role mothers play in providing a family upbringing for children;

Whereas the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women integrates a derogatory sentiment toward motherhood as manifested in the Convention's January 3, 2000 Committee Report on Belarus specifically condemning symbols such as Mother's Day;

Whereas the Senate affirms its commitment that the United States should work with other nations to enhance the protection of the fundamental right of motherhood, including the condemnation of coercive population control programs where expectant mothers are forced to undergo abortions or sterilizations;

Whereas the Convention's agenda to promote abortion worldwide invades the laws of countries that hold a religious or moral belief that abortion is the destruction of innocent human life and that it subjects expectant mothers to physical and emotional trauma;

Whereas the Convention seeks to supplant the primary care and nurturing provided by stay-at-home mothers with institutionalized daycare facilities as advocated in the Convention's August 12, 1997 Committee Report on Slovenia, which stated that children cared for at home are deprived of "educational and social opportunities offered in formal daycare institutions"; and

Whereas more than a hundred United States-based family, religious, and educational organizations representing countless millions of Americans strongly oppose United States ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the tenets of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women are incompatible with the tradition and policy of the United States to uphold motherhood and to regard motherhood with the highest degree of honor and respect;

(2) the Convention would create negative perceptions toward motherhood; and

(3) the Senate should not give its advice and consent to ratification of the fundamentally flawed Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a two-part hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

This hearing will take place on Thursday, May 18, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the first part of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2439, a bill to authorize the construction of the Southeastern Alaska Intertie system. The purpose of the second part of the hearing is to consider the nomination of Mildred Dresselhaus, to be Director, Office of Science, Department of Energy.

Presentation of oral testimony is by Committee invitation only. However, those who wish to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information regarding S. 2439, please contact Dan Kish. For further information regarding the Dresselhaus nomination, please contact David Dye.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2000, to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet

on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. on reauthorization of the Pipeline Safety Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to conduct a hearing Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., to receive testimony on the Administration's legislative proposal on the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. The markup will take place in Dirksen Room 226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing. The subcommittee will receive testimony on S. 1367, a bill to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary and for other purposes; S. 1617, a bill to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center, in Cincinnati, Ohio; S. 1670, a bill to revise the boundary of Fort Mantanzas National Monument, and for other purposes; S. 2020, a bill to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi, and for other purposes; S. 2478, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and for other purposes; and S. 2485, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege

of the floor be granted to the following Appropriations Committee detailees during floor consideration of the Senate appropriations bills and appropriations conference reports: Brian Wilson and Leslie Kalan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Daly, a fellow in the office of Senator ABRAHAM, be granted floor privileges for the period of the consideration of S. 2521, military construction fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Underriner, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO FILE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL AND REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the recess of the Senate, the Armed Services Committee be permitted to file the Department of Defense authorization bill and report at 10 a.m. on Friday, May 12, 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 307, submitted earlier by Senator HELMS, which expresses the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day, that the U.S. Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I object to my own request on behalf of the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d-276g, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be

held in Mississippi and Louisiana, May 19–22, 2000: the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY); the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE); the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS); the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS); the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH); the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY); the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX); and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA).

CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 434

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 112, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 112) to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 434.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 112) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 112(b)(1), insert “(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)” after “yarns wholly formed in the United States”.

(2) In section 112(b)(2), insert “(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed in the United States)” after “yarns wholly formed in the United States”.

(3) In section 112(b)(3), strike “countries, subject” and insert “countries (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in 1 or more beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries), subject”.

(4) In section 112(b)(5)(A), insert “apparel articles of” after “to the extent that”.

(5) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) in clause (i), strike “in a CBTPA beneficiary country” and insert “in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) strike “cut in a CBTPA beneficiary country” and insert “cut in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries”; and

(ii) strike “assembled in such country” and insert “assembled in 1 or more such countries”.

(6) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert “(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)” after “yarns wholly formed in the United States”.

(7) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert “(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed in the United States)” after “yarns wholly formed in the United States”.

(8) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(iii)(I) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike “United States, in an amount” and insert “United States (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are formed in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries), in an amount”.

(9) In clause (v) of section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) strike “fibers, fabric, or yarn” each place it appears in the heading and the text and insert “fabrics or yarn”; and

(B) strike “fibers, fabric, and yarn” and insert “fabrics and yarn”; and

(C) insert “apparel articles of” after “to the extent that”.

(10) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike “entered” and insert “classifiable”.

(11) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike “(vii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—” and insert “(viii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—”.

(12) Strike section 412(a)(2) and insert the following:

(2) in the flush paragraph at the end, by striking “and (G)” and inserting “(G), and (H) (to the extent described in section 507(6)(D))”.

(13) In the article description for subheading 9902.51.13 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as added by section 502(a) of the bill, strike “of 64’s and linen worsted wool count wool yarn”.

(14) In section 505(d), insert “to the United States Customs Service” after “appropriate claim”.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 15, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 1 p.m. on Monday, May 15. I further ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period for the transaction of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator AKAKA, 30 minutes; Senator KENNEDY, 30 minutes; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow and will reconvene on Monday at 1 p.m. When the Senate reconvenes, there will be a period for morning business not to exceed the hour of 3 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume debate on the military construction appropriations bill under the previous order. Senators who have statements in regard to this appropriations bill are encouraged to come to the floor on Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. MONDAY, MAY 15, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:31 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 15, 2000, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11, 2000:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BARRY EDWARD CARTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE SALLY A. SHELTON.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

MARK S. WRIGHTON, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2006, VICE ROBERT M. SOLOW, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN W. DARRAH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE GEORGE M. MAROVICH, RETIRED.

JOAN HUMPHREY LEFKOW, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE ANN C. WILLIAMS, ELEVATED.

RICARDO MORADO, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE FILAMON B. VELA, RETIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREWITH:

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LESLIE O’CONNOR, OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMY MARIE ALLEN, OF ARIZONA
WILLIAM H. AVERY, OF FLORIDA
STEPHEN B. BANKS, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN A. BARNEBY, OF NEVADA
BRIDGET A. BRINK, OF MICHIGAN
JENNIFER CHINTANA BULLOCK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PAUL M. CARTER, JR., OF MARYLAND
ROBERT E. GABOR, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY E. GALVIN, OF COLORADO
EDWARD G. GRULICH, OF TEXAS
SALLY BYRNE IRONFIELD, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY ALLT KENEALY, OF VIRGINIA
YURI KIM, OF GUAM
GREGORY MICHAEL MARCHESI, OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT E. MOONEY, OF CALIFORNIA
PEGGY ANN ORTEGA, OF HAWAII
ROBERT A. PITRE, OF WASHINGTON
JENNIFER L. SAVAGE, OF VIRGINIA
RUSSELL ADAM SCHIEBEL, OF TEXAS
MICHAELA A. SCHWEITZER-BLUHM, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW SEAW, OF NEW YORK
DAVID WILLIAM SIMONS, OF WYOMING
MATTHEW ALEXANDER SPIVAK, OF CALIFORNIA
CHERYL S. STEELE, OF FLORIDA
MARGARET C. SULA, OF TEXAS
MARTINA ANNA TKADLEC, OF TEXAS

BRYANT P. TRICK, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STATE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND/OR SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS INDICATED:

CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARTHA PULTZ AMLIN, OF CALIFORNIA
ALEXANDER N. AVE LALLEMANT, OF TEXAS
ALEXANDER C. BALAZS, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN A. BALLARD, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD BRERETON BESTIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MICHELLE MARIE BISKUP, OF ILLINOIS
SCOTT ALLAN BRANDON, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN G. BREEN, OF VIRGINIA
JASON E. BRUDER, OF NEW YORK
SHARON LEE CARPER, OF CALIFORNIA
CHARLES GARDNER CHANDLER IV, OF TEXAS
REID ELLICE CHASE, OF VIRGINIA
PETER THOMPSON CHISOLM, OF FLORIDA
R. DIANA CLAYTON, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW A. COTTRELL, OF WASHINGTON
AMANDA BETH CRONKHTE, OF NEW YORK
MONICA LYN CUMMINGS, OF CALIFORNIA
TRICIA B. CYPHER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHARLES A. DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER K. DERRICK, OF TEXAS
ZUZANA JANA DILLON, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD C. DONOVAN, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELLE D. EL-GHILANI, OF MARYLAND
NATHAN D. FLOOK, OF MARYLAND
DANIEL H. GERSHATOR, OF CALIFORNIA
LISA CLAIRE GISVOLD, OF OREGON
HEATHER GOETHERT, OF VIRGINIA
LESLIE M. HAYDEN, OF CALIFORNIA
DENISE MARIA HAYES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ROSCOE A. HAYES II, OF WEST VIRGINIA
KENT C. HEALY, OF CONNECTICUT
PAUL J. HERMAN, OF NEW YORK
JOHN J. HILLMEYER, OF MISSOURI
TRACY A. HISER, OF TEXAS
CATHELEN E. HULL, OF KANSAS
STEVEN HOWARD HUNSUCKER, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM K. JACKSON, OF UTAH
CHRISTINA E. JASINSKI, OF VIRGINIA
JENIFER JOYCE, OF NEW YORK
CRYSTAL T. KAPLAN, OF VIRGINIA
LISA DOUGHERTY KENNA, OF VERMONT
GORDON T. KINGMA, OF VIRGINIA
NATHANIEL P. LANE, OF CALIFORNIA
WALTER W. LUCAS, OF WASHINGTON
GEOFFREY J. MARTINEAU, OF ILLINOIS
DONALD G. MATTINGLEY, OF ARIZONA
ANDREW RAYMOND MCGOWAN, OF FLORIDA
CEZARY MENDELUS, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD CHARLES MERRIN, OF CALIFORNIA
SUSAN MICHELLE MEYER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SARA LILLI MICHAEL, OF CALIFORNIA
TIFFANY ANITA MURPHY, OF WASHINGTON
SHANE I. MYERS, OF NEW JERSEY
BRIAN W. NAFZIGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN C. O'BRIEN, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES P. O'DONNELL, OF VIRGINIA
MARTIN JUAN LEYERLY OPPUS, OF CALIFORNIA
RONALD S. PACKOWITZ, OF ILLINOIS
JOHN L. PARDUE, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE MOLLOY PEREZ, OF COLORADO
TIMOTHY C. PHILLIPS, OF CALIFORNIA
PEGGY L. PLUNKETT, OF OHIO
BRIAN STEPHEN QUIGLEY, JR., OF VIRGINIA
FORD E. ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN A. ROME, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WILLIAM JOSEPH RYAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KIMBERLEY ANN SCHAEFER, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM O. SCHMALE, OF VIRGINIA
KARA A. SISSON, OF VIRGINIA
TERRY D. STARK, OF TEXAS
TINA D. STIXRUDE, OF DELAWARE
TERENCE W. SWEENEY, OF VIRGINIA
LARUA F. TEMES, OF CALIFORNIA
NIKOLAS M. TRENDOWSKI, OF MICHIGAN
SETH H. VAUGHN, OF NEW YORK
DOUGLAS HARTZLER WISE, OF VIRGINIA
EILEEN MCDONOUGH WOOD, OF VIRGINIA

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL J. REAGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE AN ADDITIONAL POSITION CREATED DECEMBER 10, 1999, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. 372(B).

GEORGE Z. SINGAL, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE, VICE MORTON A. BRODY, DECEASED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CRAIG P. RASMUSSEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND P. HUOT, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PETER M. CUVIELLO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TIMOTHY J. MAUDE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PAUL T. MIKOLASHEK, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT W. NOONAN, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DANIEL R. ZANINI, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5044:

To be general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES W. METZGER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MICHAEL G. MULLEN, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS (CH) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

PHILIP W. HILL, 0000 CH

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH F. HANNON, 0000 CH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (*)) IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE CORPS (JA), DENTAL CORPS (DE), MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS (MS), ARMY NURSE CORPS (AN), UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

RONALD J. BUCHHHOLZ, 0000 JA

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD N. JOHNSON, 0000 MS
*DAVID MOSS, 0000 DE

To be major

*JEAN M. DAVIS, 0000 AN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JACK R. CHRISTENSEN, 0000
DOUGLAS D. ELLISON, 0000
JAMES B. GASTON, JR., 0000
DENNIS W. HELDENBRAND, 0000
JAMES A. RYAN, JR., 0000
TERRY W. SALTSMAN, 0000
DANIEL J. TRAVERS, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DENNIS J. ALLSTON, 0000
MICHAEL A. BOGACZYK, 0000
GEORGE I. BROUNTY, 0000
DAVID R. BURCH, 0000
PHILLIP D. DURBIN, 0000
JOHN J. FARLEY, 0000
JOHN T. GERMAIN, 0000
CHARLES E. GIRARD, 0000
JEFFREY W. GRAVES, 0000
GEORGE H. LAUVE, JR., 0000
DAVID L. STOKES, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRADLEY S. RUSSELL, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT E. DAVIS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

LAWRENCE J. CHICK, 0000
JOHN C. DANKS, 0000
DINO S. DELEO, 0000
KENNETH P. DONALDSON, 0000
GARRETT L.M. GARDNER, 0000
SEAN O. HARDING, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. HENRY, 0000
JEFFREY T. HEYDON, 0000
ERIC R. HORNING, 0000
DENNIS J. KLEIN, 0000
DANIEL R. LANE, 0000
MINH THANH LY, 0000
BILLY W. NORTON, 0000
LAWRENCE D. OLLICE, 0000
MICHAEL Q. PASQUARETTE, 0000
MICHAEL H. PAWLOWSKI, 0000
DARREN R. POORE, 0000
GERALD R. PRENDEGAST, 0000
KARL F. PRIGGE, 0000
TIMOTHY E. RIEGLE, 0000
KEVIN M. ROBINSON, 0000
WALLACE E. SCHLAUDER, 0000
RICHARD T. SHELAR, 0000
CAREY J. SIMS, 0000
MARK SUCHSLAND, 0000
JOHN A. WARDEAN, 0000
KIRK A. WEATHERLY, 0000
PAUL A. WHITESCARVER, 0000
THOMAS D. WHYTTLAW, 0000
MICHAEL L. WILLARD, 0000
JAMES R. WIMMER, 0000